Sheldon

ZDB

HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY

HENRY C. SHELDON,

AUTHOR OF "HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE," AND PROFESSOR IN BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

VOL. I.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

NEW YORK: 46 EAST 14TH STREET.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO.

BOSTON: 100 PURCHASE STREET.

1894.

SDW

University Press:
John Wilson and Son, Cambridge, U.S.A.

PREFACE.

THIS CHURCH HISTORY is designed to occupy a middle position between a mere compendium and those ponderous works which by their very mass are discouraging to all but professional investigators. It would have been very easy to have doubled the bulk of the production, but we are confident that in so doing we should not have increased its practical value.

Considerable attention has been paid to the demands of historical perspective. By passing lightly over subordinate themes, we have endeavored to secure space in connection with important topics for the presentation, not merely of conclusions, but also of the grounds of conclusions.

The work is not *exclusively* for professional students. We apprehend, in fact, that it has some special adaptations to the intelligent layman. At any rate, we have written with the conviction that a good knowledge of church history lies close to the vocation of every earnest-minded citizen. For one thing, it is very desirable that he should have in view such object lessons on the relations of Church and State as are furnished by a candid review of the Christian centuries.

A somewhat larger space would doubtless have been given to doctrinal history, had it not been for the

author's conviction that the detailed treatment of this subject belongs to a separate branch. It will be noticed however, that the prominent heresies have been sketched, that the field of Catholic doctrine has been defined in the different eras, and that a relatively full account has been given of the principal theological and philosophical developments which have had place since the beginning of the critical era in the eighteenth century.

We have thought it proper to devote three out of the five volumes to the Modern Church, partly on account of the breadth and complexity of the later church history, and partly on account of the relative lack of comprehensive works for this division of the subject.

In a few instances convenience of grouping has led to a departure from the scheme of periods sketched in the introduction ; but the tables of contents and the indexes will afford ready means for locating any topic.

It will be observed that on points at issue between Protestantism and Romanism we have taken more than average pains to brace our statements by documentary evidence.

The foot-notes refer to only a part of the sources consulted, but they indicate most of those having prime importance. In general, we have sought to be mindful of the maxim that, in this age of the world, it is far more important to give facts and arguments than to furnish a catalogue of the names and opinions of persons who have chanced to write about the facts. We are conscious, however, that we have supplied no ideal illustration of the maxim.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY.
April, 1894.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

FIRST PERIOD (30-313).

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH UNDER THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER II.

STRUGGLE OF CHRISTIANITY WITH HEATHENISM.

CHAPTER III.

HERESIES AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

CHAPTER IV.

CHURCH CONSTITUTION AND DISCIPLINE.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AND LIFE.

SECOND PERIOD (313-590).

CHAPTER V.

WORSHIP AND LIFE.

CHAPTER VI.

PRODUCTS OF THE ARTISTIC SPIRIT IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

APPENDIX.

INTRODUCTION.

I.—NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE words "life" and "organism" are the principal terms in the definition of the Christian Church. Without the regenerate life which flows into the world from the truth and spiritual presence of the Redeemer, only the semblance of a Christian Church can exist. On the other hand, this life, apart from an organism, lacks the proper means of its own conservation and dissemination. With life, fellowship and certain bonds of fellowship must be conjoined. The Church is not genuine believers taken individually and disjunctively, but genuine believers united into a brotherhood. The apostolic figure is not that of stones, however beautiful and polished, lying scattered and separate; but of a "building fitly framed together," or, more emphatically still, of a living body with its intimate and sympathetic connection of members.

From the terms of the definition it is speedily apparent how the Christian Church is related to the Jewish. There is at once a resemblance and a contrast. The same factors are combined, but not in the same ratio. The old dispensation was not characterized by such ful-

ness of life as is the new. It beheld only prophetically the day when the Spirit in his plenitude should be outpoured upon all flesh. Life in the Jewish Church was initial and preparatory, like the life of nature before the vernal sun has reached the maximum of his quickening power. Also, in respect of organism, the Christian appears plainly distinguished from the Jewish Church. The latter recognized no separation between civil and religious institutions. The bounds of the nation were at the same time the bounds of the Church (at least, prior to the dispersion). State and Church were one. Far different the position of the former. The Christian Church, as established by Christ and His apostles, was purely a religious institution. The Church may hold of necessity certain relations to the civil power, it may make alliances therewith more or less intimate; but in its proper character it is a religious organism. This was demanded by the universal office of Christianity. Civil organization is fractional, belongs to nations. Christianity was designed for the whole, for mankind. Hence, released from all shackles of civil and national restrictions, it was left free as a spiritual kingdom to extend its dominion over all souls.

Corresponding to the two elements in the idea of the Church, it has both an invisible and a visible side. As a life, its hidden spring is the spirit of Christ in the hearts of believers. As a fellowship or brotherhood, it has, of practical necessity, certain outward bonds of unity. Christ himself appointed such in the authority of the apostles, in the rite of baptism, and in the eucharist.

Evidently both of these aspects must be duly re-

garded in any just and well-balanced view of the Church. Let the first receive the sole emphasis, let it be said that Christian life in the heart of the believer is every thing, and the outward organization is nothing, and you have a false, dismembering independence. This is the error of an ultra Protestant spirit which tends to convert Christianity into a sandbank of incoherent particles, or at least to apportion the Christian realm into petty, ill-related provinces. On the other hand, let the latter receive an undue emphasis, let the life be absolutely conditioned upon institutions and officers, and you have worship of form and debasing dependence upon human authority. This is the error of Roman Catholicism, going on with continued increase and issuing in a practical deification of the church ceremonial and the hierarchy. Common-sense, as well as history, teaches that either extreme caricatures the true conception of the Church. The Christian Church in its earthly office must have both life and organization, as the individual must have both soul and body. The soul is truly of greater worth than the body; but still the body has claims to consideration.

In a minute definition, much might be said about each of the two factors which enter into the idea of the Church, as well as about their mutual relations. In this connection, however, we will give space to only two or three cardinal points. And first, as respects the life element, while it is not to be made unduly dependent upon dogma, it is not to be regarded as wholly independent of dogma, — that is, of doctrine measurably distinct and settled. The test of spiritual life is, no doubt, likeness to Christ. To feel toward God and to-

ward man after the similitude of Christ, is to be spiritually alive. But this life does not spring up and grow without nourishment. Genuine Christian life is no misty sentimentalism which is destitute of nameable antecedents or sources of supply. It has definite causes, and demands substantial food. It needs to be fed with truth; in other words, with dogmas laid hold upon with personal conviction, and armed with authority before the reason and conscience. Life which takes no root in dogma, which is unsustained by a vital apprehension of the great truths of revelation, is likely to be both sickly and transient. Some exception, therefore, must be taken to the language which a sprightly critic has thought fit to use upon this subject. Speaking of a time when the different communions shall be dominated by a spirit of tolerance, he says, "Dogma will become merely a mysterious ark which they will agree never to open; and if the ark be empty, of what importance is it?"[1] Tolerance is indeed to be longed for, so far as it is based upon breadth and enlightenment of mind and heart; but a tolerance which consigns dogma to the place of an empty and unopened ark is more likely to be based upon religious indifference than upon any thing else. In the mind of any man a certain margin of doctrinal views may fitly be held by a slight tenure, but to give over doctrines generally is to leave one's religious life with less than sand for a foundation. In its great doctrinal truths the Church has a perpetual source of inspiration and growth, and it might as well think of burying itself as of burying these truths out of sight. On the other hand, it is not to

[1] Renan, The Apostles, Intro.

be overlooked, that doctrines viewed as mere phrases or propositions are of little account. They are of real worth only as they actually serve to keep the image of the spiritual world, the great outlines of the divine kingdom, fresh and distinct before the mind.

As respects the outward organism of the Church, it should be noticed that the question of its importance and the question of its kind are quite distinct. Civil government is of very high importance, — is indeed, in a sense, a divine institution; still, no particular form can claim the divine sanction to the exclusion of other forms. So church government may be in general ordained of God, without either episcopacy, presbyterianism, congregationalism, or any specific combination of these being the sole valid form. Indeed, there is no Scriptural evidence whatever that any particular form of church government has, by the divine will, been made obligatory for all times and places, to the exclusion of all other forms. Even if it could be proved that one uniform system prevailed in the apostolic age, it would not follow that the Church would be bound for all time to conform to that pattern. Forms of administration, unlike doctrinal truth, admit of change along with change of circumstances, and are most legitimate when most adapted to the circumstances of the age and the people.

II. — PERIODS.

The three grand divisions in the history of the Christian Church, with their subdivisions or periods, are as follows: —

I. The Early Church.

1. From Pentecost to Constantine (30–313).
2. From Constantine to Gregory the Great (313–590).

II. The Mediæval Church.

1. From Gregory the Great to Gregory VII. (590–1073).
2. From Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII. (1073–1294).
3. From Boniface VIII. to the Reformation (1294–1517).

III. The Modern Church.

1. From the Reformation to the Peace of Westphalia (1517–1648).
2. From the Peace of Westphalia to 1720.
3. From 1720 to the present.

It is possible that in one or two instances equal convenience might have been realized by drawing the dividing line at a different point. Still, it will not be difficult to find a reason for each item in the scheme adopted. The decree of toleration published by Constantine in 313 marked such a decisive change in the fortunes of Christianity that the first period is properly made to end at this date. Before the end of the sixth century the repeated incursions of the barbarian tribes had largely overthrown the old civilization in the West. At the same time, moreover, the Church, in the tenor of its worship and life, had advanced far toward the phases which were dominant in the Middle Ages. It is obviously suggested, therefore, that the pontificate of Gregory the Great should be allowed to introduce the history of the Mediæval Church. In passing through the intervening centuries to the Reformation, we natu-

rally make a threefold division, since the mediæval order of things had its formative period, its period of culmination, and its period of decline or incipient disintegration. The Peace of Westphalia was of profound significance as respects the relation of Roman Catholic and Protestant powers upon the Continent. It happened also that England witnessed a great crisis near the date of this famous settlement. The year 1648, therefore, is fixed upon as ending the first period of the Modern Church. A second period of modern history is made to end at 1720, not because that specific year was marked by any event of signal importance, but because about this time an era of criticism, an era of decided tendencies toward new departures, was inaugurated. The interval between 1720 and the present might be subdivided. However, as it will be convenient, in consideration of the complexity of the more recent history, to consider the leading countries by themselves, the divisions may be made for the different nations according to their most noted epochs.

III.—THE ROMAN EMPIRE AS RELATED TO THE INTRODUCTION AND SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

The history of our Lord's birth is prefaced by the statement that a decree went forth from Cæsar Augustus for the taxing of the whole world (Luke ii. 1). Thus Christianity was born at the mid-day of the imperial greatness of Rome. Evidently this conjunction was no accident. The age of Augustus was the age of the Advent, because in the decision of God the fulness of time had then come. The Roman Empire was di-

vinely appointed to be the field in which the seed of the gospel should be sown. And this field was for the first time in proper readiness when the honor of Augustus could be celebrated with this inscription: "Safe are now land and sea; the cities flourish in unity and peace."[1] All the aids to Christian evangelism which a hostile heathen world was competent to provide were now at hand.[2]

1. Intercommunication, and Breaking-down of National Barriers. — The Roman Empire was in a remarkable sense a world-realm. Its extent was great. It stretched from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, from the Lowlands of Scotland to the African deserts and the cataracts of the Nile. Its population was probably between eighty and a hundred and twenty millions. But it was not mere extent which gave to the Roman Empire its peculiar cast of universality. Other empires have surpassed it in this respect. The Roman was pre-eminently a world-realm in that it was pre-eminently representative of the whole world during the centuries of its supremacy. To the apprehension of its citizens and subjects, there was scarcely any thing

[1] Found at Halicarnassus.

[2] In the outlook upon the Roman Empire which is here attempted, much service has been rendered us by the following authors: Theodor Mommsen, History of Rome, translated by W. P. Dickson; G. Uhlhorn, Der Kampf des Christenthums mit dem Heidenthum, — a very inspiring volume, accessible to the English reader in the translation by Smyth and Ropes; C. Schmidt, Essai Historique sur la Société Civile dans le Monde Romain et sa Transformation par le Christianisme; L. Friedlaender, Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms (3 vols., 1881); J. J. I. Döllinger, Heidenthum und Judenthum; G. P. Fisher, Beginnings of Christianity.

worthy of attention beyond its borders. The great factors of civilization, Greek, Roman, Jewish, Oriental, were here brought together. Barbarian tribes made their contribution of fresh life and capacity for new developments. In short, stretching her borders about all the lands circling the Mediterranean, and compassing the more important portions of three continents, Rome took up into herself the most valuable products of past ages, and the most fruitful germs of those that were to come. No wonder that she appeared destined, in her unrivalled possession of the world, to perpetual dominion; and that even among the persecuted Christians the idea found entrance, that when Rome fell the end of all things would immediately follow.[1]

The building-up of an empire by Rome was, in an emphatic sense, a work of unification. She brought together the dissevered. She established peaceful communication where no interchange had existed except that of war and plunder. The entire plan of Roman conquest and polity encouraged intercommunication. The idea which Augustus had in mind when he set up a golden milestone in the Forum was industriously pursued. From the capital a net-work of highways was extended, designed to bring the most distant provinces

[1] "We know," says Tertullian, "that a mighty shock impending over the whole earth — in fact, the very end of all things, threatening dreadful woes — is only retarded by the continued existence of the Roman Empire." (*Apologeticus*, xxxii.; compare *ad Scapulam*, ii.) Lactantius writes: "The subject itself declares that the fall and ruin of the world will shortly take place; except that while the city of Rome remains, it appears that nothing of this kind is to be feared. But when the capital of the whole world shall have fallen, who can doubt that the end has now arrived to the affairs of men and the whole world?" (*Div. Inst.*, vii. 25.)

into intimate connection with the great centre. These Roman roads are justly celebrated. Their very remains are calculated, above almost any thing else, to fill the mind with reverence for the greatness of Rome. Five main lines led out from the imperial city. Maps giving directions, distances, and stopping-places, ministered greatly to the convenience of the traveller. Probably Europe at the beginning of this century enjoyed no better means of communication by land than were provided in the major part of the Roman Empire. It may be doubted, also, whether, prior to the building of railways, travel has ever borne a greater ratio to population than it did under the Roman Cæsars.[1] The demands of government kept officials moving to and fro. Enlarged opportunities of trade brought men out of their isolation. An intense curiosity naturally stimulated the residents of the provinces to visit the renowned seat of empire. Already in the time of Cicero we find Rome described as a community assembled from out of the nations, *civitas ex nationum conventu constituta*.[2] Between Augustus and Marcus Aurelius the population of the city averaged above a million, possibly at times reached a maximum of two millions. On the other hand, curiosity, personal interests, and governmental policy sent great numbers from Rome and Italy to the provinces. Tourists poured into Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt. Students flocked

[1] The subject is amply treated in all its bearings by Friedlaender. It would appear, from a number of instances which he cites, that the excellent highways afforded means of a quite rapid transit. Cæsar, for example, is said to have travelled seven hundred and ninety-six miles inside of eight days. (*Sittengeschichte Roms*, vol. ii. p. 17.)

[2] De Petitione Consulatus, xiv.

to the renowned seats of culture, especially Athens and Alexandria. Sophists and rhetoricians were commonly itinerants. Armies went forth and served in remote districts as agents of Romanizing influences.

The mere fact of this interchange was enough to greatly weaken tribal and national feeling, and to make men conscious of their relation to the vast body of the race within the Empire. It was all in the direction of the fusion of the individual in the universal. But to this means others were added by the Roman administration. The *colony* was made to perform an important part. "In her numerous colonies," says Uhlhorn, "Rome stretched herself out into the provinces; they were a section of Rome in the midst of Spain, Gaul, or Greece. The colonists took with them their citizenship and their Roman jurisprudence. Often strangers were received into the colony; and, even when they formed a separate community in its neighborhood, they were placed still under the constant influence of the Roman spirit."[1] Among the places celebrated in New-Testament history, Philippi, Troas, and Antioch in Pisidia may serve as examples of the colony.

Similar in design to the planting of colonies was the extension of privileges to communities and individuals

[1] Kampf des Christenthums, Book I., chap. i. An equally apt description is that given by Conybeare and Howson. "The characteristic of a *colonia* was, that it was a miniature resemblance of Rome. . . . The colonists went out with all the pride of Roman citizens, to represent and reproduce the city in the midst of an alien population. Their names were still enrolled in one of the Roman tribes. Every traveller who passed through a *colonia* saw there the insignia of Rome. He heard the Latin language, and was amenable, in the strictest sense, to the Roman law." (*Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. i., chap. ix.)

in the provinces. The good-will of distinguished places was solicited or confirmed by constituting them *free cities*. Athens, Thessalonica, Tarsus, and the Syrian Antioch held, among others, this rank, and enjoyed in virtue of it certain rights of local self-government. The crowning right, that of citizenship, was much extended after the time of Julius Cæsar. Under his rule it was made to reach and even to cross the extreme limits of Italy, being conferred upon those dwelling beyond the Po, and also upon many communities in Transalpine Gaul and in Spain. Succeeding emperors enlarged the circle of enfranchisement, until at length, in the early part of the third century, the outside provinces stood on an equality with Italy in this respect.[1] Citizenship carried with it exemption from scourging, the right to appeal to the emperor, the right of suffrage, and eligibility to office.

Roman jurisprudence likewise performed an important function in the great unifying process. To be sure, Roman law was primarily designed for Roman citizens. Its application therefore was not co-extensive with the Empire till the right of citizenship became general. But even before this era, it shaped, more or less, the administration of justice in all the provinces. Thus there was a movement toward an all-embracing system of jurisprudence, a system which in many points showed an admirable appreciation of the relations of man to man. Here, evidently, was an effica-

[1] The decree extending citizenship to the subjects of the Empire generally was issued under Caracalla. His motive is said to have been quite other than an enlightened liberality. (Dio Cassius, lxxvii. 9.)

cious means of unity and homogeneity. Like the framework of a building, Roman law extended through the structure of Roman society.

Something like an index to the progress made in breaking down national barriers may be seen by comparing the language of Aristotle with that of Marcus Aurelius. According to the testimony of Plutarch, Aristotle advised Alexander the Great, on the eve of his expedition into Asia, "to bear himself as a prince among the Greeks, his own people, but as a master among the barbarians; to treat the one as friends and kinsmen, the others as animals and chattels." "My nature," says Marcus Aurelius, "is rational and social; and my city and country, so far as I am Antoninus, is Rome, but so far as I am a man it is the world."[1] The philosophic Emperor here expresses the Stoic idea of an universal citizenship. The requisite conditions for the development of that idea were first supplied by the conquests of Alexander, and the Roman Empire provided for its further growth and continued assertion. To be sure, the universal citizenship of the Stoic was very much of an abstraction. As contrasted with the universal brotherhood of Christianity, it was, practically, like the shadow compared with the substance. In other words, Stoicism had little inspiration or power for the realization of its ideal. Still, the existence of the ideal is a clear token of a relative disappearance of national boundaries, and the exaltation of the idea of a common humanity. From our stand-point it is difficult to realize the importance of this work of disintegration, this breaking-down of national barriers. A

[1] Meditations, vi. 44.

community exists between the great body of nations to-day that was quite foreign to the states of antiquity. Such a bond of union as is supplied by a common Christian civilization was unknown to them. Had they remained intact, unfused, Christianity would have been obliged again and again to penetrate through the hard wall of a tenacious national spirit. Roman power set open doors before the advancing gospel. Its universal temporal rule prepared for the universal spiritual dominion of Christianity. A missionary activity like that of Paul, it has been well said, is inconceivable save upon the theatre of an empire like that of Rome.[1] Moreover, in proportion as national barriers disappeared, the conditions were made directly favorable to the reception of the monotheistic faith. In the view of polytheism, individual gods were, to a great extent, associated with individual nations. As these nations were absorbed into a common whole, they felt, of course, less occasion for asserting their respective deities. In proportion as the unity of the race was acknowleged, it was easy to acknowledge the Divine unity.

2. Culture. — The culture within the Roman Empire most worthy of attention, most serviceable to Christianity, was Greek rather than Roman. Rome was more a representative of the will than of the intellect; her office was rather that of the lawgiver and the

[1] This is a truth which was not hid from the observation of early Christian writers. Origen, among others, taught in very explicit terms that the fusion of the nations into one monarchy was a providential preparation for the preaching of the gospel to the whole world. (*Cont. Celsum*, ii. 30.)

ruler than that of the teacher. Her strictly original contributions to polite literature and philosophy were of but moderate compass. At Rome, says Mommsen, nobody speculated except the money-changers.[1] Nevertheless, it was no mean service which Rome performed for culture. If she did not create largely, she distributed widely. The versatile Greek had already carried his treasures into many lands; Rome caused those treasures to be scattered over a still broader field.

Among the contributions of Greek culture we notice, —

(1) *A language admirably adapted to the uses of Christianity.* At the time the gospel began to be proclaimed, Greek approached the character of an universal speech. The Greeks were very early a colonizing people, and carried their language into various settlements, from Asia Minor to Spain. The conquests of Alexander spread the same language over a large section of the Asiatic Continent. It was extensively spoken in Palestine; the disciples of Christ, very likely, had heard it from their childhood. In Egypt, especially at the great city of Alexandria, it was made the instrument of a varied, active, and highly celebrated scholarship. It found, after the Roman conquest of Greece, an open road to Rome. A multitude of Greek slaves diffused it far and wide among the principal households of Italy. Teachers, rhetoricians, and philosophers supplied also numerous agents for its introduction. Cicero could plead with entire sincerity in behalf of Archias: "Greek is read in almost all nations; Latin is confined by its own boundaries, which, of a truth, are narrow."[2]

[1] History of Rome, Book IV., chap. xii. [2] Pro Archia poeta, chap. x.

Probably the French language, at the era of its highest ascendency in Europe, was far less the medium of mercantile and polite intercourse than was the Greek in the Roman Empire in the age of the apostles.[1] In almost every city the Greek-speaking evangelist could find listeners who would readily understand his proclamation. Nor was the Greek the special servant of Christianity merely in virtue of its universality: it was such in virtue, also, of its peculiar excellencies as a language. Without a rich and flexible medium, the new truths which Christianity was designed to teach could not have found suitable expression. The Greek language supplied such a medium. It was capable of expressing different shades of meaning with nice discrimination. It was comparatively rich in religious and ethical terms, and so was adapted to be the language of the New-Testament oracles. It was rich in philosophical terms, and so was well suited to the uses of a fundamental theology.

(2) *Elements more or less akin to the Christian system.* "Hellenism is as much a prodigy of beauty as Christianity is a prodigy of sanctity."[2] The ideals embraced by the two are different, but the very fact that both embrace high ideals establishes a certain affinity between them. High ideals cannot be antagonistic to each other. However it may be in other spheres, in the moral sphere the beautiful stands in close conjunction with the good; indeed, the supremely beautiful is here identical with the good. A keen sense for the beautiful, therefore, carried into the sphere of moral

[1] Compare Fisher, Beginnings of Christianity, chap. ii.
[2] Renan, The Apostles, Intro.

thought, naturally brings forth products in which Christianity, as the system of the good or the holy, can take pleasure. The products are in full correspondence with the soil, when we find in the Greek poets, and especially in the philosophy of Plato, passages which express high and noble views upon man's moral relations. We are far from discovering, it is true, even in Platonism, the full Christian ideal, either as respects God or man. For example, that principle of holy love which Christianity makes the crowning glory both of God and of man, the sum and source of moral excellence, was but dimly discerned by Plato; at least it does not receive an adequate prominence in his system. Still, Platonism embraced many lofty and healthful conceptions of the Godhead, and of man's nature and place in the universe. Historical proof that it possessed a certain kinship to Christianity is at hand in the fact that it served not a few inquiring minds as a stepping-stone to the faith of the gospel.

(3) *A striking example of man's need of divine instruction and help.* This negative contribution was of no small worth. The intellectual system of the Greeks was the highest triumph of the human mind in the ancient world. It was the supreme specimen of what the natural man may achieve. As such it served as a test of man's natural ability to give a satisfactory solution of the problems of life and destiny, and a satisfactory supply to spiritual needs. Had Greek wisdom accomplished this, then the human soul might have congratulated itself upon its ability to work out its own salvation. But it failed: it was able to meet suitably neither the questionings nor the moral needs of the

soul. Its best conclusions were too much of the nature of guesses, did not carry with them the requisite authority and assurance. In this relative failure Greek wisdom published the need of something higher and more efficient than itself. The issue of its history re-enforced the suggestion of Plato, that a revelation must come from the Godhead to man if he is to be guided securely.[1] The gospel might indeed be repelled as foolishness in the first impulses of pride. But the need had been proved. The gospel stood over against a demonstrated, and in some measure a felt, need. There was an empty place in the human soul which it was suited to fill, and which it would be called to fill when it had broken down the bars of opposition by the proofs of its intrinsic virtue.

3. Morals. — The age immediately preceding and following the birth of Christ affords a striking example of the difference between good moralizing and good morals. There was a plenty of the former. In no prevous era of classic antiquity had casuistry been so fully developed, the duties of men in all relations so elaborately specified. Many noble sentiments, many maxims worthy of a place in a hand-book of Christian precepts, found expression. Especially fruitful in this

[1] In the midst of a dialogue on the destiny of the soul, Simmias, after remarking to Socrates respecting the exceeding difficulty of reaching certainty on such subjects, is made to say of the investigator, "He should persevere until he has attained one of two things: either he should discover or learn the truth about them: or, if this be impossible, I would have him take the best and most irrefragable of human notions, and let this be the raft upon which he sails through life, — not without risk, I admit, *if he cannot find some word of God which will more surely and safely carry him.*" (*Phædo*, Jowett's translation.)

direction was the New Stoicism, which numbered Cato and Brutus among its earliest representatives at Rome, and found in Seneca (A.D. 2–66) its most noted literary exponent. But what was the practical result of all this preaching and indoctrination? A few men made stronger and more robust in character, and probably only a few. Those who used the fine sounding dialect of Stoical virtue were greatly in excess of those who fulfilled its difficult precepts. Even the Seneca who moralized so grandly on the nothingness of the world is credited with having added to his immense fortune by oppressive usury.[1] He seems also not to have been above a species of accommodation in his relation to the emperors, having written the official laudation of Claudius which was pronounced by his successor,[2] though his real opinion of that emperor was expressed in a satire;[3] and having composed, moreover, the lying epistle to the Senate, which attempted to clear Nero from the guilt of murdering his mother.[4] Other charges of a very serious nature were whispered by contemporaries,[5] but they may properly be disregarded as being perhaps only the malicious insinuations of the slanderer. Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius seem to have been better models as respects personal conduct. They stood, however, in a small group. The Stoic morality was in general powerless to heal either society or the individual. It was strikingly destitute of motive power. In pursuance of its pantheistic theory it obscured the

[1] Merivale, General History of Rome. Dio Cassius, lxii. 2.
[2] Tacitus, Annal., xiii. 3.
[3] Dio Cassius, lx. 35.
[4] Tacitus, Annal., xiv. 10, 11. J. F. Hurst, Meth. Rev., April, 1876.
[5] A full list is given by Dio Cassius, lx. 8, lxi. 10.

reality of sin, the personality of God, the distinction between providence and fate, and set a limit to the separate existence of the soul. Pushed to its logical issue, it stamped emptiness and vanity upon the very nature of man. It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that it did so little to arrest the progress of corruption. The work of the philosopher is not indeed to be despised. All honor is due to his good intent, his noble lessons in morals, and, in some instances, his example of high-minded conduct. But Roman society evidently needed more powerful means of regeneration than any which he was able to contribute.

In the states of Greece, a marked decline in morals was apparent soon after the Peloponnesian war. The binding power of the oath was greatly diminished; honesty and purity were at a discount. A similar declension began in the Roman Republic after the second Punic war, and went on with widening and deepening effect far into the first century of the Christian era. As the field of conquest was enlarged, the sturdy Roman virtue came into contact with demoralizing customs and influences. Greek laxity, Oriental indulgence, and abounding wealth brought their temptations to bear. As if to make up for ages of continence in the past, pleasure-seeking was now pursued to an amazing extreme of voluptuousness and license.

The moral bankruptcy of the times is amply attested both by the statements of writers and the evidence of facts. The vigorous impeachment by the Apostle to the Gentiles[1] is not at all in excess of that which comes from Seneca. "All things," says the Roman moralist,

[1] Epistle to the Romans, i.

"are full of crimes and vices. A great struggle is waged for pre-eminence in iniquity. Daily grows the appetite for sin; daily wanes the sense of shame. All respect for excellence and justice being cast aside, lust rushes on at will. Crimes are no longer secret: they stalk before the eyes of men. Iniquity is given such a range in public, and is so mighty in the breasts of all, that innocence is not merely rare: it has no existence. Think you that there are only a few individuals who have made an end of law? From all sides, as at a given signal, men have sprung to the task of confounding right and wrong."[1] In the satires of Juvenal the strictures upon the age, if less serious in tone than the above, are no less indicative of moral degeneracy. Some allowance may be made for rhetorical exaggeration in the statements of these writers; but a glance at the different ranks of society and the different phases of social and domestic life will satisfy us that their arraignment was far from groundless.

(1) *The Emperors and the Imperial Court.* — To judge society at large by such emperors as Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Domitian, and others of like stamp, would doubtless be gross injustice. They are not to be taken unqualifiedly as exponents of their times. On the other hand, it would be an irrational excess of charity to regard them as complete exceptions to their age. They were not so much foreign to the soil upon which they grew, as its ranker and more towering growths. Their tyranny was only an exaggerated form of the current disregard of human life. When we hear Caligula remarking, in a moment of disappointment and spite, that

[1] De Ira, ii. 9.

he wished the Roman people had but one neck,[1] we recognize simply the same temper, grown to monstrous proportions, which made the populace delight in the cruel and bloody sports of the amphitheatre. In like manner their overgrown luxury was but a crowning expression of the voluptuousness and prodigality of the age. A Caligula spending four or five hundred thousand dollars on a single day's banqueting;[2] or a Nero building his "golden house,"[3] with its lavish adornment, and its triple colonnade reaching the length of a mile, or travelling with a thousand vehicles as his ordinary retinue (the animals being shod with silver, the drivers

[1] Suetonius, in the same paragraph in which he records this exclamation of Caligula, says, "He generally prolonged the sufferings of his victims, by causing them to be inflicted by slight and frequently repeated strokes; this being his well-known and constant order: 'Strike so that he may feel himself die.'" (*Lives of the Twelve Cæsars: Caligula*, xxx.)

[2] Seneca says, "C. Cæsar Augustus, quem mihi videtur rerum natura edidisse, ut ostenderet, quid summa vitia in summa fortuna possent, centies sestertio cœnavit uno die. Et in hoc omnium adjutus ingenio vix tamen invenit, quomodo trium provinciarum tributum una cœna fieret. (*Ad Helviam*, x.) Compare the following from Suetonius: "In the devices of his profuse expenditure, he surpassed all the prodigals that ever lived, inventing a new kind of bath, with strange dishes and suppers, washing in precious unguents, drinking pearls of immense value dissolved in vinegar, and serving up for his guests loaves and other victuals modelled in gold; often saying that a man ought to be a good economist or an emperor." (*Caligula*, xxxvii.) It has been suspected that in the eccentricity of Caligula there was a spice of real insanity.

[3] A special feature in Nero's palace was the provision for luxurious banqueting. "The supper-rooms were vaulted; and compartments of the ceilings, inlaid with ivory, were made to revolve and scatter flowers, while they contained pipes which shed unguents upon the guests. The chief banqueting-room was circular, and revolved perpetually, night and day, in imitation of the motion of the celestial bodies." (SUETONIUS: *Nero*, xxxi.)

and footmen dressed in showy and costly garments), while a herd of five hundred she-asses was added for his wife Poppæa, that she might daily bathe in their milk, — these were examples which many were ready to imitate in proportion to their means.

(2) *The Nobility.* — In the closing period of the Republic, the civil wars had greatly reduced the number of the old senatorial families. To keep their ranks good, it was necessary from time to time to add recruits from the second rank of the nobility, the knights. Sometimes men of the third rank were promoted to the first. Even freedmen, in the later times of the Empire, were occasionally lifted to the summit of the nobility. The senators, in virtue of their position, belonged especially to the city of Rome; the knights were scattered over the Empire, and occupied the first place in the provincial cities.

The senators were the foremost sharers in the spoils of conquest. In the current phraseology, a senatorial estate was but another name for a large fortune. The richest had an annual income approaching to a million of dollars. The annual income of senators of the second rank ranged from two hundred to three hundred thousand dollars.[1] Senatorial estates were found in all parts of the Empire. In the time of Nero, six land-owners possessed half of the province of North Africa.[2]

Expenditure, however, was quite on a par with income. To support the ordinary senatorial dignity, in accordance with the ideas of the times, required no

[1] See estimates of Friedlaender, vol. i. [2] Ibid.

small outlay. Many were involved in bankruptcy,[1] and instances were not wanting of senators and knights, out of sheer desperation, turning gladiators. Those whose great wealth seemed to defy exhaustion went beyond all bounds in luxurious living, especially between the reigns of Augustus and Vespasian.[2] Their banquets, in particular, were scenes of indulgence and display. No delicacy that money could provide was wanting. Hosts of slaves, bands of musicians, and dancing-girls were in attendance. Even the coarse expedient of an emetic was sometimes used to prolong the pleasures of appetite. "They vomit," says Seneca, "that they may eat, and eat that they may vomit, and will not so much as digest the viands which they bring together from the ends of the earth."[3] No doubt, as regards the mere amount of income and outlay, individuals in recent times have rivalled the Roman millionnaires. But in no age or country, probably, has abounding wealth been

[1] The incapable debtor commonly postponed a declaration of insolvency to the latest date possible. "Instead of selling his property, and especially his landed estates, he continued to borrow and to present the semblance of riches, till the crash only became the worse, and the winding-up yielded a result like that of Milo, in which the creditors obtained somewhat above four per cent of the sums for which they ranked." (MOMMSEN, Book V., chap. xi.) Such prodigality in the use of riches was of course accompanied by much iniquity in their acquisition. "Falsifying of documents and perjuries had become so common, that in a popular poet of this age an oath is called 'the plaster of debts.' Men had forgotten what honesty was. A person who refused a bribe was regarded, not as an upright man, but as a personal foe." (*Ibid.*)

[2] "The luxury of the table," says Tacitus, "which from the battle of Actium to the revolution by which Galba obtained the Empire, a space of a hundred years, was practised with the most costly profusion, began then gradually to decline." (*Annal.*, iii. 55.)

[3] "Vomunt ut edant, edunt ut vomant, et epulas, quas toto orbe conquirunt, nec concoquere dignantur." (*Ad Helviam*, x.)

accompanied to such a degree by mere greed of display, by mere lust after bodily pampering, as it was among the grandees of Rome in the first century. This followed largely from the manner of its acquisition. Large fortunes, gathered by plunder from the vanquished, or by extortion from subject provinces, were naturally made subservient to a carnal prodigality.

(3) *The Untitled Freemen.* — The tendency within this class was toward a common level of poverty. The large number of small landholders, who so worthily represented the class at an earlier period, had gradually disappeared, at least in the Italian provinces. Confiscations in the time of the civil wars dispossessed many of those who were most attached to the soil. Men who had served in the legions naturally became tainted with unquiet and feverish impulses, retained little taste for the sober employment of agriculture, and speedily sold out their possessions. Small estates were merged in the larger, until a few landholders held the whole country. Meanwhile, slavery closed the great mass of employments against the freemen. Aside from the unfavorable competition which was created by an overflowing slave-market, the institution put the seal of disgrace upon labor.[1] Only in a few departments of industry, such as medicine, architecture, philosophy, and the office

[1] "The often used and often abused phrase of a commonwealth composed of millionnaires and beggars applies perhaps nowhere so completely as to Rome of the last age of the Republic; and nowhere perhaps has the essential maxim of the slave-state — that the rich man who lives by the exertions of his slaves is necessarily respectable, and the poor man who lives by the labor of his hands is necessarily vulgar — been recognized with so terrible a precision as the undoubted principle underlying all public and private intercourse." (MOMMSEN, Book V., chap. xi.)

of the advocate, could a man retain his respectability?[1] Even trade, except on the scale of large speculations and wholesale transactions, was counted disreputable. There was no chance, therefore, for a flourishing middle class. A few who had the courage to brave public opinion, and to enter lucrative but unpopular employments, amassed good fortunes. Some found a meagre living by acting as clients of the rich. Many were supported by rations from the public crib. From one hundred thousand to three hundred and twenty thousand men were fed in this way at Rome, and lived in idleness. With idleness was naturally joined an excessive greed for amusements. Bread and plays were the demand of the populace.

(4) *The Freedmen.* — If lower in honor, the freedmen were in many respects higher in privilege than the free-born. A great variety of trades and offices was open to them. They served as select employees of the nobility. In the earlier history of the Empire they constituted nearly the whole body of officials at the imperial court. Some acquired immense fortunes, and vied with the senatorial rank in luxurious living. Narcissus possessed four hundred million sesterces (about twenty million dollars), Pallas three hundred million sesterces, and some others scarcely less.[2] As to character, their circumstances tended to foster an extra degree of depravity. Slavery had educated them in the arts of deceit; the stain of their former position impaired their sense of honor; opportunities were frequently provided for advancing themselves by serving the baser impulses

[1] See Cicero, De Off., i. 42. Schmidt, Essai Historique, i. 3. 1.
[2] Friedlaender, vol. i., p. 83.

of their patrons. By natural consequence, the band of flatterers, informers, and supple tools of tyrants found many a recruit from among the freedmen.

(5) *The Slaves.* — At the beginning of the Christian era, the slave portion of the Roman Empire no doubt greatly out-numbered the free. In the Grecian states, while yet they retained their independence, the slaves were vastly in excess of the freemen. Attica had four hundred thousand slaves at a time when the whole number of free native-born citizens was only twenty thousand, and the resident strangers ten thousand. This may be regarded as an exceptional ratio, but some approach to it may have existed in other districts. Roman conquests turned men into slaves by the ten thousand. Single masters, in some instances, possessed from ten to twenty thousand.[1]

Greek slavery for the most part was of a somewhat milder type than the Roman; but even among the Greeks there was no security whatever for the chastity of female slaves. In general, the slaves were so much material placed at the absolute disposition of the lust and caprice of the owner. He could maim, torture, or even kill without being called to account. The prætor Domitianus caused a slave, who unseasonably had slain a boar in the chase, to be crucified. Cicero simply remarked on the case: "That might, perhaps, seem severe."[2] A slave who broke a valuable dish at a banquet where Augustus was present was condemned by his enraged master to be cast to the fishes.[3] In course of time the law placed some restrictions on the absolute

[1] Döllinger, Heidenthum und Judenthum, p. 708.
[2] Uhlhorn; Schmidt. [3] Seneca, De Ira, iii. 40.

power of the master. But as late as the reign of Nero an old law was put in force, which allowed, in case of the murder of a master by an unknown hand, that all slaves who had slept under the roof at the time should be put to death. Under this law, the murder of the city prefect, Pedanius Secundus, was avenged by the execution of four hundred slaves. An eminent senator, C. Cassius, defended this rigor before the senate.[1] Practically, and to a large extent theoretically, the slave was placed outside the pale of a common humanity. The benevolent teaching of Seneca, that even a slave is a man and is to be treated with consideration,[2] was commonly regarded as only a specimen of fanciful and enthusiastic sentiment. Evidently such a system must have been, beyond all estimate, corrupting. It depraved both parties. It worked licentiousness and tyranny in the master, and debased the slave. So patent was the latter fact to the slave-dealers themselves, that the market price of one who had served a year was less than that of a new slave.[3]

(6) *Domestic Life.* — The most emphatic token of moral downfall appears in the loss of the proverbial honor and fidelity of Roman women. The Japhetic birthright of chastity was nobly maintained in Italy for centuries. All through the history of Rome, down to the close of the second Punic war, many a Roman matron had the spirit of a Lucretia. Divorces were comparatively unknown. Plutarch says that there was no case of divorce for two hundred and thirty years,

[1] Tacitus, Annal., xiv. 42-45.
[2] De Clem., i. 18; De Beneficiis, iii. 20; Epist., xlvii.
[3] Döllinger, Heid. und Jud., p. 713.

and another writer has given the much longer period of five hundred years.[1] Whether strictly correct or not, these statements are indicative of wonderful fidelity to family ties among the early Romans. But in the last days of the Republic, and the first of the Empire, the unmaking of marriages was about as common as their making. Marriage without the *manus* became the current form as admitting the most ready dissolution. People in high life led the way in the growing laxity. "C. Sulpicius divorced his wife because she had gone unveiled upon the street. Q. Antistius Vetus divorced his because she had spoken openly and familiarly to a freedwoman. P. Sempronius Sophus sent his away because she had gone to the play without his knowledge. Æmilius Paulus, the conqueror of Perseus, put away his wife without assigning any cause at all. And how was it among the contemporaries of Cicero? He himself separated from his first wife, in order to take a wealthier one; from his second, because she did not seem sufficiently afflicted over the death of his daughter. Cato, with all his moral strictness, divorced his first spouse Atilia, who had borne him two children, and delivered over his second wife Marcia, with the approval of her father, to his friend Hortensius, after whose death he married her again. Pompey put away his wife Antistia, in order to make family connection with Sylla, and took his step-daughter Æmilia, who, however, had first to be separated from her husband Glabrio, by whom

[1] Plutarch is thus quoted by Uhlhorn. Döllinger refers to Dionysius as naming the longer period. Tertullian makes the interval nearly six hundred years. (*Apol.* vi.) One can hardly escape here a suspicion of exaggeration.

she was with child. After her death he took Mucia, whom he also divorced in order to marry Cæsar's daughter Julia. On their side, women separated themselves from their husbands without any cause except their mere pleasure."[1] In fine, it was not altogether hyperbole when Seneca spoke of noble women as reckoning their years by their successive husbands rather than by the number of the consuls.[2]

Corresponding to the facility of divorce was the infidelity to existing conjugal relations. Seneca goes so far as to affirm that a species of contempt attached to the man who had no love-intrigues.[3] "Liaisons in the first houses," says Mommsen, "had become so frequent, that only a scandal altogether exceptional could make them the subject of special talk; a judicial interference seemed now almost ridiculous."[4] In individual instances women of noble family, in order to suffer no hinderance from the laws against adultery, went to the horrible extreme of having their names entered on the list of public prostitutes.[5]

The same spirit which gave a loose reign to passion naturally was averse to the cares of family. Great numbers avoided the marriage bond; so that in the time of Augustus, the State thought it necessary to take cognizance of the matter, and to impose a special tax upon those remaining unmarried above a certain age. To many of the married, children were an undesired burden; and the practice of infanticide, or of exposing the new-born, was correspondingly frequent. Roman con-

[1] Döllinger, Heid. und Jud., p. 702. [2] Seneca, De Beneficiis, iii. 16.
[3] Ibid., i. 9. [4] Book V., chap. xi.
[5] Suetonius, Tiberius, xxxv. Tacitus, Annal., ii. 85.

science became as lax upon this subject as the Greek. The old law which forbade the exposing of children except in case of abnormal birth, and then with consultation of neighbors, became obsolete. The jurist Paulus, in the time of the emperors, recognized the full right of the parents over the life of newly born children.[1] As a natural result, Italy began to experience a state of things with which Polybius a little earlier had reproached Greece, and which he distinctly referred to criminal abuse of the parental relation. The Roman stock was more and more reduced.

Supplementing the ordinary forms of impurity, were those excesses and those unnatural vices of which "it is a shame even to speak." Impurity was the crying iniquity of the declining classic world. Even worship was made to pay tribute to licentiousness. Prostitution entered into the religious service of Aphrodite at Corinth. The Bacchic orgies, as practised among the Greeks, and transferred to some extent to Rome, were accompanied by indecent excesses. Pederasty was so common in Greece that all sense of its enormity seems to have vanished. Some of the most eminent Romans, from the emperor down, copied the vice. Hadrian had the shameless infatuation to deify, and build temples to, the youth Antinous with whom he had lived in this vile affinity.[2]

[1] Döllinger, Heid. und Jud., p. 716. Schmidt, Essai Historique. Tertullian accuses the Romans in these terms: "Although you are forbidden by the laws to slay new-born infants, it so happens that no laws are evaded with more impunity or greater safety, with the deliberate knowledge of the public, and the suffrages of this entire age." (*Ad. Nationes*, i. 15.)

[2] Clement of Alexandria speaks of the worship still paid in his day to Antinous, and adds a worthy inculcation of the Christian idea that there is no true beauty apart from purity. (*Cohortatio*, iv.) Compare Origen, Cont. Cel., iii. 36.

(7) *Plays and Shows.* — The theatre endeavored to sustain itself by pandering to the depraved tastes of the populace, and offered plays in which scenic exhibitions, striking or obscene, took the place of the substance. But, with all its accommodation, the theatre could not fairly compete with the attractions of the circus and the amphitheatre. The race of the circus and the combat of the amphitheatre were the highest luxuries of a people fanatically intent upon pleasure. The exhibitions of the kind at Rome were thronged by tens or even hundreds of thousands. The great circus in the time of Titus had seats for two hundred and fifty thousand persons, and in the fourth century it could seat three hundred and eighty-five thousand. The amphitheatre of the Flavians was able to accommodate eighty-seven thousand spectators.

In the eyes of the politician, great shows were not merely luxuries, but necessities. They were looked upon as approved means of keeping the people in proper humor. Hence, they were provided by the best and the most frugal of the rulers, as well as by the worst and most prodigal. The games instituted by Augustus during his reign brought ten thousand men into the arena. An equal number fought during the games instituted by Trajan, and extended over the space of one hundred and twenty-three days. Eleven thousand beasts were slain during the same time. Spectacles in which large bodies of combatants simultaneously engaged were sometimes given, — battles and sea-fights,[1] that mim-

[1] These were sometimes given in the amphitheatre, there being ample means for flooding the arena as occasion required. Sometimes spectacles of this order were on a scale exceeding the accommodations of the

icked and in part reproduced the stern tragedy of war.

The demand for combatants caused gladiatorial schools to be established, in which, as Cyprian complains, "training was undergone to acquire the power to murder."[1] The gladiators consisted mainly of condemned criminals, captives taken in war, and slaves.[2] In some instances men volunteered for the bloody trade. The number of lives sacrificed in these inhuman spectacles, though not comparable to the number of those slaughtered in the wars of the times, must still have been very great. For we must recollect that the gladiatorial combat was by no means confined to Rome. "Wherever the ancient world bore the impress of Roman culture, the spectacle of the amphitheatre was extended; and from Jerusalem to Seville, from England to North Africa, there was no important city in which the arena was not, year after year, moistened with the blood of numerous victims."[3] Sometimes scenes were introduced into the arena excelling in savagery the fight between man and man. Use was made of condemned criminals to reproduce the tragic scenes of history and mythology. "Arrayed in costly, gold-embroidered

amphitheatre. The most extensive sea-fight was that given by Claudius on Lake Fucinus. (TACITUS, *Annal.*, xii. 56.)

[1] Epist., i. 7. Compare the incisive words of Tatian: "You slaughter animals for the purpose of eating their flesh, and you purchase men to supply a cannibal banquet for the soul, nourishing it by the most impious bloodshedding. The robber commits murder for the sake of plunder, but the rich man purchases gladiators for the sake of their being killed." (*Orat. ad Græcos*, xxiii.)

[2] There were instances, however, in which knights, senators, and even women fought in the arena. (SUETONIUS: *Augustus*, xliii.; *Nero*, xii.; *Domitian*, iv. DIO CASSIUS, xliii. 23, li. 22.)

[3] Friedlaender, vol. ii.

tunics and purple mantles, adorned with golden crowns, they present themselves. However, as from the fatal vesture of Medea, flames suddenly spring out of these splendid garments, in which the unfortunates miserably perish. Scarcely was there a form of torture or fearful mode of death known to history and literature, with whose representation the people were not entertained in the amphitheatre. One saw here Hercules upon Œta, dying the fiery death; Mucius Scævola holding his hand over the basin of coals until it was consumed; the robber Laureolus, the hero of a well-known farce, torn to pieces by wild beasts, while he was suspended from the cross."[1] We recoil from the thought of men and women making a pastime out of scenes like these. But such, almost without exception, was the case with the heathen Romans. At any rate, apart from Seneca,[2] we find in the Roman literature of the times scarcely an expression of abhorrence of these cruel diversions. The amphitheatre is, by itself, a powerful testimony to the fact that Roman antiquity knew little about the sanctity which Christianity attaches to man as man.

The description which has been given of Roman morals applies more strictly to the capital city than to other portions of the Empire. Still it has its application in the broader range. Many of the provincial cities went far toward emulating the vices of the great

[1] Friedlaender, vol. ii. See instances cited by Tertullian, Apol., xv.; Ad. Nationes, i. 10.

[2] Epist., vii. Cicero speaks of those who regarded the gladiatorial combat as cruel and inhuman. His reply indicates his belief that such a spectacle, though degenerating into cruelty as actually managed, might under proper limitations be made to serve a useful end. (*Tusc. Disput.*, ii. 17.)

metropolis. Corinth, for example, was not far behind her imperial mistress in reputation for licentiousness. From a city no larger than Pompeii, relics of an impure civilization have been exhumed which deserved to have been buried longer than eighteen centuries.

There is, no doubt, a liability to an exaggerated impression upon this subject. We must make due account of the stand-point of the age. We must not overlook the instances of upright living. There were noble-spirited men in the first century, as the example of Plutarch and others assures us. There were pure homes, faithful husbands and wives, as may be gathered from sepulchral inscriptions. License and inhumanity were not everywhere supreme. But it must be acknowledged that they were fearfully prevalent. No subsequent age has produced a parallel. While local corruption in some instances may have approached the standard of the degenerate Romans, there has been no modern instance in which society, throughout its length and breadth, from the top to the bottom of its civilization, has been equally vitiated. The demoralization was extreme, because the demoralizing agencies were of unwonted force. There were no props to virtue adequate to meet the pressure which ensued when Occident and Orient met together, when the pride and egoism nurtured by unbounded conquests came into contact with Eastern laxity and luxury.[1]

[1] If one desires the verdict of a *liberal* critic, he has it, at least as respects the higher classes, in the following from Renan: "The Roman aristocracy which had conquered the world, and which alone of all the people had any voice in public business under the Cæsars, had abandoned itself to a Saturnalia of the most outrageous wickedness the human race ever witnessed." (*The Apostles*, chap. xvii.)

In some respects this state of morals was unfavorable to the introduction of Christianity. Sensibilities benumbed by vicious indulgence are not the most readily responsive to a deeply spiritual message. But, on the other hand, indulgence itself may create a sense of satiety. So was it to no inconsiderable degree in the Roman Empire. An oppressive sense of the emptiness and vanity of earthly things rested upon many minds. The age had reached the goal of illicit pleasure-seeking. It had gone down to the bottom of the inclined plane, and had found there its fill of misery. By a natural reaction, a desire was awakened for a better state of things. Christianity came forward just at the right time to re-enforce and to guide this desire.

4. Religion. — Parallel with the decline of morals was the disintegration of religion. The first movement here was in the direction of unbelief; then followed a movement in the direction of superstition. Very positive tokens of the former development were apparent in Greece by the close of the fifth century before Christ; in Rome it had not made much headway till two or three centuries later. The zenith of this sceptical tendency was probably reached before the preaching of the gospel by the apostles.

Among the causes contributing to unbelief were great political revolutions. The classic religions were local in their scope; they were intimately associated with particular soils; they were interwoven with the interests and functions of individual states. Hence, any great disruption of the State, any extensive and permanent revolution of its condition, was likely to affect vitally its religion. Irretrievable calamity left

men to question whether the gods whom they had worshipped as the special guardians of their nation were worthy of their homage; and this question was put with all the more doubt because temporal rather than spiritual good was sought from the gods. We can easily imagine, that, as the despotism of Rome swallowed up state after state, the faith of the people in their ancestral deities was severely strained. On the other hand, unexampled prosperity, an expansion of empire such as fell to the lot of the Romans, carried them beyond the sphere with which at least many of their gods were commonly associated. This led naturally to the recognition of new gods, or to changed conceptions of the old ones. In either case the innovation was more or less of an unsettling factor, and could easily result in scepticism.

This brings us to a second occasion of unbelief, — the contact of different religions. Heathen systems more or less diverse in spirit and principle were brought within the bounds of the same empire. Romanism, with its practical gods, viewed pre-eminently as guardians of political, social, and domestic relations; Hellenism, with its æsthetic gods, its ideals of grace and beauty; Orientalism, with its worship of the various symbols of the divine life that abides in nature, with its mysticism and elements of austere devotion, — all came into relations of mutual contact and interchange. Men's ears were assailed with the names of strange gods. Their attention was called to a motley group of deities, who, in accordance with Roman custom, were invited from conquered provinces to take up their abode in the "eternal city." What wonder, when so many

were putting forth claims to homage, if in many minds the claims of all were discredited!

Another occasion of unbelief was intellectual growth and philosophic thought. The fables and follies of the old polytheisms became too apparent to men of intelligence and scholarship to permit any real faith on their part in those systems. In some instances, scepticism verged upon atheism. Epicureanism was practical atheism, inasmuch as it put aside all question and concern about the existence of a Supreme Being. But in the majority of instances the learned rejectors of the ancient mythologies acknowledged the Godhead in some form; many were inclined to a kind of pantheistic conception of the Supreme Being, and regarded him as the soul of the universe. If, as was generally the case with this class of men, they practised and enjoined the old state worship, it was simply on grounds of policy. They looked upon such a worship as a necessary bond of unity in the State, a necessary instrument in the control of the great mass of men who were incapable of apprehending any thing better. Hence, we find Polybius (about 204–122 B.C.) praising the political wisdom which the Romans manifested in so carefully sustaining the religion of the State. Varro (116–28 B.C.), though he was devoid of all faith in the common polytheism, and taught that the State is older than the gods, as the painter is older than the picture, still thought it necessary to maintain the customary worship of the gods among the people. Cicero (106–43 B.C.) and Strabo (about 54 B.C. to A.D. 24) gave evidence of a like conviction with respect to the practical utility of the civil religion. Seneca also judged that

respect for order, and reverence for ancestral customs, supplied a sufficient occasion for worshipping the gods according to the established religion, though in his opinion such worship was nothing to the gods themselves.[1]

How far the unbelief of the learned descended to the masses, is a question that is difficult to answer. Probably among the majority of those in any wise accessible to the new currents, scepticism was more practical than theoretical, and consisted rather in loss of enthusiasm for the ancient faith than in positive denial and repudiation of the same. They were not so much prepared to reject their old divinities as to give them a fragmentary worship, making new objects of idolatry their rivals. Still we may presume that there was a fraction of the people in all the large cities to whom the common heathen religion was nearly as much a blank as it was to Valerius Maximus, when, in the preface to his work (A.D. 29–32), he appealed to the Emperor Tiberius rather than to another god, because the emperor was a god who was known to exist, while the existence of the other gods was only a matter of conjecture. In fact, no inconsiderable portion of the worship came to be paid to the emperors. Magnificent temples were dedicated to the divine Augustus, and the other imperial gods in various quarters of the Empire. Some of the emperors did not wait for the post-mortem deification. Augustus and Tiberius yielded to requests of Asiatic cities who wished to give them a place among their deities.[2] Caligula went further, arrogating for himself

[1] Compare Augustine, De Civ. Dei., iv. 30, 31, vi. 10.
[2] Tacitus, Annal., iv. 37.

the character of a god, and ordaining a magnificent worship in his own honor.[1] Domitian was equally in haste for divine honors, and applied to himself the title, "Lord and God."[2] In some instances the favorites of the emperors were raised to the deified rank. Ending with Diocletian, we have, it is computed, no less than fifty-three formal deifications, of which fifteen applied to women of the imperial family.[3] Think of being required to pay homage to such gods! Yet for no gods over or in the Empire was homage so jealously exacted as for these. To refuse to render tokens of idolatrous respect to the emperor, was counted not merely an infraction of religious duty, but a crime against the majesty of the State. It was just this refusal, therefore, which sent thousands of Christians to martyrdom.

The emperor-worship was only one among the innovations of the age. Unbelief had hardly reached its maximum before the current set in the direction of superstition. For any surrender of old rites, double compensation was sought in new and strange worships. If the old system of auguries and omens was in part neglected, a swarm of astrologers, soothsayers, and necromancers were eagerly consulted in its place. A decisive bent toward the mystic and the obscure in religion was engendered. On this account the rites of

[1] "He instituted a temple and priests, with choicest victims, in honor of his own divinity. In his temple stood a statue of gold, the exact image of himself, which was daily dressed in garments corresponding with those he wore himself. The most opulent persons in the city offered themselves as candidates for the honor of being his priests, and purchased it successively at an immense price." (SUETONIUS: *Caligula*, xxii.)

[2] Suetonius, Domitian, xiii.

[3] Döllinger, Heid. und Jud., p. 616.

the Orient became especially attractive. Egyptian, Syrian, and even Persian gods claimed their devotees in Rome. The feeble opposition of the Government was soon broken down. Emperors themselves became worshippers of Isis and others of the mystic deities of Egypt and the East. Nero, after devoting himself for a time to the Syrian goddess, turned to fetichism, and awarded his supreme confidence to the image of a little girl which was given him by an obscure plebeian.[1] According to Pliny, he also indulged his superstition in a less harmless way, offering human sacrifices in connection with the magic arts which he practised for a long time.[2] In the second century superstition almost wholly took the place of unbelief, within the domain of heathenism. Among the strongest evidences of this is the fact that the most eminent and philosophic men of the time paid tribute to superstitious fears or beliefs. Even the Stoic philosophy of Marcus Aurelius was no adequate safeguard; and we find him, in connection with the war against the Marcomanni, calling priests from all lands to Rome, and engaging himself so long with the foreign rites that he joined the army considerably later than was expected.

This relative disintegration of heathen religions is one of the most prominent tokens that the fulness of time had come. Between men satisfied with their faith and men who have become restless or dissatisfied, there is an immeasurable difference, as respects the feasibility of conversion to a new system. The heathen world had become restless. It found no lasting satisfaction in unbelief; and where unbelief had come to its logical re-

[1] Suetonius, Nero, lvi. [2] Hist. Nat., xxx. 5, 6.

sult, and issued in increased superstition, it still failed of real satisfaction. Men became the devotees of different gods, and experimented with different rites, to discover that none could bring the desired rest and healing. A longing was felt for a God in whom unlimited confidence could be reposed. At the same time an unwonted attention was directed toward the future. There was a growing desire for definite assurance with respect to the life beyond the grave. It was largely in pursuance of this desire that men were so zealous after initiation into mysteries old and new; for these had special reference to the gods presiding over death and hades. In the enjoyment of their special favor, the initiated hoped for a happier life in the hereafter than was prepared for men in general. It was a searching, experimenting age. Men felt the need of a more perfect revelation concerning God and immortality than was anywhere to be found in the heathen world.

With desire some measure of expectation was joined. Place was found for the idea that the whole circle of the ages, from the golden to the iron, having been run, the circle was now to begin afresh, and a new golden age to be introduced. Virgil, already, in the reign of Augustus, took up this hope; and in his fourth eclogue embodied it in the son of Pollio, in language strongly suggestive of the words of Isaiah (ix., xi). He pictures a divine child who was to usher in an era of unknown peace and blessedness, — a true presentiment, but wrongly applied, for this son of Pollio died miserably in prison, a victim of Nero's tyranny. According to Döllinger, the description of Virgil was only one among several interpretations that were given to a prediction found in

the Sibylline prophecies at Rome.[1] In any case, it is probable that Jewish prophecy had much to do in originating these expectations. Perhaps we may refer to the same source the saying, mentioned by Suetonius[2] and Tacitus,[3] that he should go forth from Judæa, who was destined to rule the world.

The sense of need, and the gleams of expectation entertained in the heathen world, especially the former, ministered greatly to the victorious progress of Christianity. To be sure, Christianity did not assume to meet the need in a way that was acceptable. It was too spiritual and too crucifying to the pride of the natural man to be readily received by the great mass. The heathen world, apart from an elect few, misunderstood its teachings, spurned its offers, and contended fiercely against its evangelism. Nevertheless, Christianity was essentially adapted to meet the needs of which that restless heathen world had an underlying consciousness. It proclaimed the God in whom unlimited confidence could be reposed, and declared the immortal life with an inspiration and authority that had never before been witnessed. Prejudice and carnality were strong to oppose the religion of the Crucified, but the deep needs and aspirations of the age were stronger still to urge its acceptance. The pagan multitudes in the first centuries were much like the stalwart

[1] Heid. und Jud., p. 733.

[2] "A firm persuasion," says Suetonius, "had long prevailed through all the East, that it was fated for the empire of the world at that time to devolve upon some one who should go forth from Judæa." (*Vespasian*, iv.)

[3] Historiæ, v. 13. "Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens profectique Judæa rerum potirentur."

sinner under conviction, — loath to yield to Christ, violent against Him, but still drawn toward Him by pressure of need.

IV. — THE JEWS OF THE DISPERSION.

In the first century, no less than in the nineteenth, the Jews were at once the most exclusive and the most universal people in the civilized world.[1] God gave to them these contrasted features, since he had assigned to them the twofold office of preparing a birthplace for Christianity, and of opening a way for it in the heathen world. It was necessary that they should be unlike other nations, lest through amalgamation with them they should corrupt the legacy of monotheistic faith with which they had been intrusted; at the same time representatives of the nation must be in the midst of all other nations, to serve there as witnesses of the true God. Wide as was the Roman Empire, there was scarcely a corner of it into which the Jews had not penetrated by the age of Augustus. The geographer Strabo, writing in that age, testifies that it was difficult to find a place in the world where this race had not established itself.[2] In Egypt they numbered a full million, and by themselves occupied two out of five divisions of the great city of Alexandria. They were spread over Syria and the region about Babylon. They were numerous in Asia Minor, and were found in the cities of Mace-

[1] The main points under this topic are admirably presented by Uhlhorn.

[2] Compare the words which Josephus addressed to his countrymen: "There is no people upon the habitable earth which have not some portion of you among them." (*Wars of the Jews*, ii. 16. 4.)

donia, Greece, North Africa, Sicily, and Italy. At Rome they formed quite a large body as early as the days of Herod the Great. According to Josephus, the delegation which came from Palestine in the year 4 B.C. was re-enforced by eight thousand residents of the metropolis.[1] Not long thereafter their nationality was probably represented in all the civilized portions of Europe. The first certain account of their being settled in Spain dates from the beginning of the third century.[2]

As respects their standing, they were the objects of much hatred and ridicule. But, notwithstanding all this, they acquired no little influence and privilege. From the days of the captivity, through a long course of centuries, they had been educated to adapt themselves to new and strange conditions. They submitted with customary readiness to the existing administration, and so won for themselves not only toleration, but substantial favors at different times; such as the free use of their religious rites, exemption from military service, and the privilege of sending stated contributions to the temple at Jerusalem.[3] Seneca expressed a very emphatic estimate of their influence, even speaking of them as the conquered giving laws to the conquerors.[4]

As concerns propagandism, they did not win very many proselytes in the strict sense. A much greater number, without subjecting themselves to circumcision and the whole ceremonial law, engaged to keep the general code of Jewish morality and some of the more im-

[1] Antiquities of the Jews, xvii. 11, 1.

[2] Emil Schürer: Lehrbuch der neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, § 31.

[3] Josephus, Antiq , xiv. 10.

[4] Quoted by Augustine, De Civ. Dei, vi. 11.

portant of the ceremonial requisitions, more especially those relating to the Sabbath and to forbidden meats. Not a few of the higher class of women belonged to this order (Acts xiii. 50; xvii. 4, 12).

In addition to this circle there was a class who made, indeed, no profession of Judaism, but still felt the force of its monotheistic teaching. These being at once free from Jewish pride and exclusiveness, and having greater religious intelligence than the mass of the heathen population, were among the foremost to accept the gospel message. Hence, even when the synagogue closed its doors against the apostles and the Christian evangelists, it helped to prepare for the acceptance of their preaching. In another way, also, Judaism was made to loan assistance to the gospel, whether willingly or unwillingly. For several decades, Christianity passed with the Roman authorities as simply a phase of Judaism, and enjoyed, therefore, the toleration which was given to the latter, instead of being put at once under the ban which a new and uncompromising religion, unsupported by specific national associations, might have been expected to invite.

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM PENTECOST TO CONSTANTINE.

30–313.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

FIRST PERIOD, FROM PENTECOST TO CONSTANTINE,

30–313.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH UNDER THE APOSTLES.

I. — CREDIBILITY OF THE APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

THE dogmatic denial of the supernatural is the mainspring of attack upon the apostolic history as given in the New Testament. Renan speaks for the whole circle of kindred souls when he says, "It is an absolute rule of criticism to deny a place in history to narratives of miraculous circumstances."[1] From their stand-point, miracle is only another name for delusion or falsehood; all records of miracles belong to the region of myths, legends, or intentional fabrications.

The chief objection to the *absolute* rule of Renan is the omission of a very important word. His language should be: "It is an absolute rule of *my* criticism," etc. This wording brings out properly the personal assumption which is embodied in his, or any equivalent, state-

[1] The Apostles, Intro.

ment. His rule, as stated by himself, is simply a private opinion arbitrarily set forth under the guise of an universal maxim.

Renan, however, denies that his rule is the product of arbitrary assumption. It has, he maintains, the most palpable basis possible. It is no uncertain item of a metaphysical system; "it is simply the dictation of observation." Here, again, we must accuse the learned author of a grave omission. The qualifying pronoun is no less required in this than in the previous statement. His argument, reduced to its essential contents, amounts to this: I have never seen a miracle; I have never had communication with a trustworthy person who has seen a miracle: therefore, from the dawn of time until now no miracle has ever occurred. How much broader the conclusion than the premises! Very likely M. Renan never saw a miracle; but he is not entitled to make his experience the absolute standard of the experience of all men in all ages: to do this is wholesale assumption and begging of the question.

But give us the proof, says Renan; establish the reality of a single miracle: otherwise, we shall be entitled to reject every account of miraculous events which antiquity has handed down to us. This challenge is evidently no call to bring up all the arguments which can be adduced in favor of any particular miracle of Christ or of his apostles. The strain of our dogmatist implies that nothing but a miracle in the present, or the near neighborhood of the present, could satisfy. It is absolutely necessary that he himself, or the learned critics in whom he has implicit confidence, should be on hand with their tests. It would not do to depend

upon the testimony of ignorant and credulous people. Even the learned critics themselves must be well prepared, for if they were taken by surprise they would be certain to suspect artifice. Nothing remains, then, but to have the miracle wrought according to pre-arrangement. A pre-arranged miracle! The Almighty compelled to take part in a show gotten up by human caprice and presumption! The barricade of the critic's "absolute rule," it is to be feared, will have to be left standing. The sayings and the doings of Christ, if they have been correctly reported by the evangelists, surely discourage the expectation that miracles will be wrought in answer to the challenge of unbelief.[1] Clear, rational considerations stand equally in the way of such an expectation. A miracle having once been wrought under the supposed circumstances, its proof would rest upon the evidence of testimony no less than that of any miracle already on record. The same unbelief which called for the first would call for a second miracle, and in default of a satisfactory response to its arbitrary demand would cast suspicion upon the accounts of the previous miracle, finding possibly in the very fact of pre-arrangement an occasion for accusing the witnesses of having sold their verdict. On the other hand, if every demand were answered with a miracle, the educative power of law would be nullified, and Christianity would descend from the high office of a spiritual teacher to the poor function of ministering to an inordinate greed for supernatural manifestations. Not the demand of a captious unbelief, but the faith of a devoted co-

[1] Matt. xii. 38–42, xvi. 1–4; Mark viii. 11, 12; Luke xi. 29–32; Acts i. 7.

laborer with God, is the appropriate channel for the descent of supernatural virtue. The miracle is incidental to a work of beneficent intent and high importance.

No doubt one may occupy a superstitious attitude toward the supernatural, and affirm miraculous intervention where there is no warrant for the affirmation; but, on the other hand, it is quite possible to occupy a superstitious attitude toward nature, to lose sight of the might and independence of spirit in a nerveless awe before the strength and uniformities of material forces. The latter superstition may be thought to be more respectable than the former; still it is a superstition, and to entertain it is no evidence of a superior and well-balanced mind.

Speculative objections to miracles are without convincing force, as has indeed been allowed by some of the more discerning opponents themselves of the supernatural. So long as God is not relegated to the hapless and nondescript condition of a being who is destitute of freedom and intelligence, there is a clear possibility of His intervention in the course of things; yea, one might say a clear probability, since the extraordinary is intrinsically suited to reach certain results which the ordinary mode of working cannot compass.

The reality of the New-Testament miracles, then, is a subject which may claim an open field in the sphere of historical and rational evidences. Like all facts of history, it does not of course admit of strict demonstration. Yet it is supported by considerations which come with peculiar cogency to a candid mind. These early miracles had an adequate occasion in the greatest fact

of religious history, — the introduction of Christianity. They were wrought without any striving after show or ostentation. They appear in almost every instance to have been prompted by a holy benevolence. They are ascribed to agents who were instrumental in producing the grandest moral and spiritual revolution the world has ever known. They are recorded in narratives which bear as prominent marks of honest intention as any narratives whatever in the whole range of history. These narratives are broadly contrasted in spirit and contents with the great mass of apocryphal, mythological, or legendary writings. There is in them no sign of a preference for the magical over the moral. The miracle is made accessory to ethical and spiritual aims. It appears as incidental to an era of grand uplift, and is woven into the record of this era. So far from being a mere attachment to revelation, or means of its confirmation, it is a part of the organism of revelation, an integral factor in the great historic process by which God has not merely intimated, but powerfully emphasized and richly illustrated, His gracious purpose.

The expulsion of the supernatural from the record places criticism under bonds to reconstruct the apostolic history. In at least one instance, within the century, this demand has been met with great earnestness. The reconstruction effort of the Tübingen school, especially as represented by Ferdinand Christian Baur, whatever it may be charged with, cannot be charged with lack of industry and painstaking. This school, it is true, did not start out with any such open and unqualified edict against miracles as that contained in the dictum of M.

Renan. But its attitude toward them has been in fact scarcely more tolerant, and in its scheme the problem of the origin and early progress of Christianity becomes simply the question how the given conditions naturally evolved the given result.[1]

The theory of Baur in its full length and breadth has ceased to command much patronage among scholars. Various representatives of his school have modified it in one point or another. It may be, however, appropriately reviewed in this connection, as a convenient means of testing the trustworthiness of the apostolic record.

Baur, in his reconstruction of the apostolic history, assumes that primitive Christianity differed widely from the Christianity which appeared after the middle of the second century, and that a large portion of the New Testament is more nearly expressive of the latter than of the former. The transition from one type to the other was by a development analogous to the evolution of the idea, according to the Hegelian system. As one notion involves its contrary, and the movement between these issues in a third in which the two first find their higher unity and reconciliation, so was it with the different types of Christianity. What the first disciples drew from Christ's teaching was little else than a spiritualized Judaism. Peter and his co-apostles taught nothing else. They remained fixed within the bounds of Judaism. Their conception of Christ was

[1] The Tübingen scheme is given in substantially the same outline by Baur in his Kirchengeschichte, vol. i. 1863, and also in his Paulus; by Schwegler in his Nachapostolische Zeitalter; by Zeller in his Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles, trans. by Joseph Dare; and by the author of Supernatural Religion.

the Ebionite conception of a human Messiah. From first to last this was the nature of Petrinism. Paul was the first really to transcend Jewish limits. He had a generalizing talent, aspired to a philosophy of religion, and gave to Christianity its cast of universality. But he won no favor from the other apostles. During the whole life of the leading apostles, Paulinism remained in sharp and bitter conflict with Petrinism. How far the breach was from being healed before the death of Paul, is evident from the Apocalypse. Unsoftened by the memory of his martyrdom, the author of this Judaic production, who very likely was none other than the Apostle John, leaves no place to Paul in the apostolic college, and praises the Ephesian church for having rejected him as a deceiver and pretender.[1] But ere long the antagonism began to be modified. Writings appeared which looked toward a harmonizing of the contending parties. The first to present the olive-branch was the Epistle to the Hebrews. This proceeds from the Judaic stand-point. At the same time it approaches Paulinism, and sets forth a reconciling principle. It makes Judaism simply a preparatory dispensation, and brings it into line with Christianity, as exemplifying imperfectly that idea of priesthood which finds its perfect expression in the latter. Another writing which proceeded from the Judaic basis was the Epistle which was sent forth under the name of James. This has, to be sure, a tinge of hostility to the Pauline doctrine of justification. At the same time it is not thoroughly anti-Pauline, and aims to set forth a platform of agreement between the

[1] Kirchengeschichte, p. 81.

contending parties.[1] From the side of Paulinism the effort at reconciliation embodied itself in a number of writings, such as the *pseudo*-Pauline epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Timothy, and Titus. The so-called First Epistle of Peter also reveals unmistakably a Pauline stand-point. The most elaborate product of the union effort in the school of Paul is presented us in the Acts of the Apostles. The author of this book goes so far in his peacemaking zeal as thoroughly to falsify history, devising an extended and artificial parallelism between the lives of the two rival apostles, exhibiting Peter in a Pauline garb, and making Paul as Petrine as possible. Finally the work of mediation reaches its consummation in the Fourth Gospel, which was composed after the middle of the second century. This resolves all contradictions. "It rises into the lofty regions of transcendental philosophy, leaving far below all past differences. To the writer of that Gospel, Jews and Gentiles come into one and the same category; they both belong to the kingdom of darkness, which is perpetually at war with the kingdom of light."[2]

The unhistorical nature of Baur's theory is evinced by a variety of considerations. It is indicated by the concensus of thought and feeling in the latter part of the second century. If the antagonism between Paul and the other apostles was the most conspicuous fact in the annals of early Christianity, how happened

[1] Some of the later representatives of the school of Baur differ with him on this point. Hilgenfeld makes the Epistle of James bitterly anti-Pauline. (*Einleitung*, 1875.)

[2] So Pressensé summarizes the statement of Baur on the Fourth Gospel.

it that the knowledge of it had so soon and so thoroughly faded away throughout the length and breadth of catholic Christendom? How happened it that Irenæus and the contemporary Fathers had no thought of such an antagonism as having ever existed? Again, Baur's theory runs into the incredible in the insinuations which it makes against the character of the apostles. While there is no need to idealize these men, it is rational to conclude, from the impress which they made, that they were men of great moral earnestness and spiritual elevation. Surely we may credit men of such grand achievement with a fair degree of honesty and magnanimity. Now, the words of Paul show that the apostles, even the chief of them, acknowledged him to his face, and pledged their friendship. What, then, is to be thought of a speculation which asks us to conclude, that, in gross violation of this friendly profession, they were capable of indulging covert and malicious thrusts at the character and work of Paul? Again, the unhistorical nature of Baur's theory is indicated by the desperate dealing with the apostolic writings to which he is driven. In maintaining his position, he is constrained to make a wholesale onslaught against the New Testament, and to impeach the genuineness of books concerning which the early Church entertained no doubt, and against which a valid objection has never been urged. To say nothing about the Gospels, he is obliged to reject all the general Epistles and all but four of Paul's Epistles. It also argues against his theory, that he finds it expedient to make so much of writings like the *pseudo*-Clementine, — writings representing, at most, an obscure heretical sect, and no more entitled

to serve as an index of primitive Christianity, than Mormonism is to stand as an exponent of original Protestantism.

The four Epistles of Paul whose genuineness is conceded by Baur are Romans, First and Second Corinthians, and Galatians. To limit the evidence in the case to these four writings is in itself an exceedingly arbitrary procedure. But Baur's arbitrariness goes a step farther. He takes apologetic passages in Paul's writings, as giving the absolute type of what Paul was in general. Now, unless the apostle is to be thrown entirely out of the category of ordinary humanity, this is an unwarranted procedure. No one, for example, would look for the complete attitude of Luther toward good works in passages which he penned in the full blaze of his indignation against the Pharisaic and commercial view of justification. Paul, indeed, wrote with a much steadier hand than Luther; still it is intrinsically probable, that, in cases where no definite issue was raised, and no principle was openly at stake, he appeared rather more tolerant toward Jewish peculiarities than he did in an express effort to combat the delusion that the yoke of Jewish ceremonialism must be bound to the necks of all converts to Christianity. It is plainly a one-sided polemic, which freely charges the other apostles with inconsistencies, but allows to Paul no flexibility in addressing himself to differing circumstances, and well-nigh denies him the prerogative to indulge any change of moods.

Let us now take up Baur's excerpt from the New Testament, the four Epistles which he acknowledges, and see what ground they afford for his fundamental

thesis respecting the radical antagonism between Petrinism and Paulinism. We have in the first place the fact that a party is mentioned which was opposed to Paul, and inclined to uphold the superior claims of Peter (1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22). It is possible that this was a Judaizing party. Paul, indeed, does not say that it was such; but he does mention Peter as the leading representative of the apostleship of the circumcision, while to him was committed the gospel of the uncircumcision (Gal. ii. 7–8), and it is more than likely, in view of this acknowledged contrast of office, that the party which favored Peter was of a Judaizing cast. But is there any evidence that this party spirit extended to the apostles, that they shared in it, or that it was based upon any essential antagonism between them? The language of Paul gives not the slightest warrant for any such inference. His communication to the Corinthians indicates no jealousy toward Peter. On the contrary, he rebukes even more explicitly the childishness of appealing to Paul (1 Cor. i. 13–16), than that of appealing to Peter. He intimates the fullest confidence that Peter, equally with himself, is included in the unity of Christ (1 Cor. i. 12–13; iii. 21–23). He was evidently himself raised above the low plane of this partisanship, and he gives no indication but that the names of the other leaders were used entirely without their consent.[1] There is nothing in the way of the belief that Apollos and Peter were entirely free from

[1] What Paul says in Rom. xv. 25–28 is something more than a testimony to his own kindly feeling. If he were conscious of a combination against him, patronized by leading apostles, how could he write in such a strain respecting those dwelling in the very citadel of Petrinism?

responsibility for the partisan adherence of those who made their boast in them. It would be, moreover, nothing strange if there was no ground for the three parties in the three men other than the differences which always exist between men of marked individuality. They may all have taught substantially the same system of doctrine, being distinguished only as respects manner, spirit, and relative emphasis upon different classes of truths. History is full of illustrations of how slight are the occasions which may give rise to parties. Among men of limited compass and different prejudices, some of Gentile and others of Jewish antecedents, the mere fact that Paul was the apostle of the uncircumcision and Peter of the circumcision could easily serve as an occasion of a Pauline and a Petrine party. That the extreme wings of these parties would misrepresent the two apostles, and magnify beyond measure the differences between them, would follow almost as a matter of course. Many historical parallels teach us that the principals are not to be judged by the extremists of parties. To judge Peter by a rigid and narrow-minded Ebionism, and Paul by the wild speculations of Gnosticism, is simply absurd. Streams may be very near together, or even one, at their source, which are far distant from each other at their mouths. In fine, the rise of Petrine and Pauline parties is no proof of any radical differences between Peter and Paul. That they represented somewhat diverse types of thought, is of course to be conceded. But diversity is not contradiction. Diversities supplementing each other are a large element in the charm and completeness of the New Testament.

In the second place, we have an account in the Epistle to the Galatians of a disagreement between Paul and Peter. In the eyes of the Tübingen school this is of vast importance. But the significance of a disagreement depends entirely upon its nature. Because two bishops differ on a point of administration, it is not to be concluded that they represent antagonistic systems of theology or polity. No more does it follow, because Paul and Peter differed on the propriety of eating, or refraining from eating, with the Gentiles of Antioch, under a special set of circumstances, that there was any radical antagonism between them as respects principles. On the contrary, the context shows that the question was not so much about the acknowledgment of a principle, as about fidelity to a principle acknowledged in common by both Paul and Peter. Paul says of Peter, "Before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision" (Gal. ii. 12). This language plainly indicates, that, in the opinion of Paul, the real views of Peter were indentical with his own; that he not only considered the door of the Church open to the Gentiles, but that within the Church the Gentiles were to stand on an equality with the Jews. Peter was right in theory. But those who came from James had never been accustomed to association with the Gentiles; Peter was afraid that their Jewish prejudices would be shocked overmuch by his free intercourse with the Gentiles, and so withdrew from their table. This seemed to Paul to be pushing accommodation to the sacrifice of principle, and drew forth his rebuke. That Paul

introduces this scene is no indication of a permanent rupture between him and Peter. He introduces it as one factor in the proof that in communication with the chief apostles he had maintained his equality with them, had asserted his apostleship, and asserted it consistently with his belief in the freedom of the Gentiles from the law of Moses. There is nothing here, or elsewhere, to indicate that any thing more than this single disagreement on a point of *conduct* ever came between him and Peter. He gives no hint that he is at war with the apostle of the circumcision. On the contrary, he acknowledges his apostleship, the effectiveness of his apostleship, and is careful to specify that he, as well as James and John, gave to himself the right hand of fellowship (Gal. ii. 7–10).[1]

The single passage in Galatians ought to be regarded as refuting the charge of Baur, that the Acts of the Apostles give a false account of Peter, and represent him as being much more free and generous toward the Gentiles than he really was. There is nothing in the Acts which goes beyond the implications of Paul's statement that Peter, so far as his private convictions were concerned, was free to eat with the Gentiles. In

[1] The suggestion that Paul, in his mention of false apostles (2 Cor. xi. 13), refers to Peter and others of the Twelve is too absurd for even the most captious critic, being in flagrant contradiction of what Paul himself says in his Epistles. There were then in the Church those who might be characterized as false apostles. Paul is allowed to speak of such without being suspected of insinuations against the Twelve. Why not grant the same privilege to the latter? Surely criticism is making an unseemly exhibition of its bias, and running into gratuitous libel, when it assumes that John in the Apocalypse, in the face of his former commendation of Paul, proceeds to number him with false apostles.

like manner, a candid comparison of the Acts with the Epistles will vindicate the truthfulness of the former with respect to Paul. Baur, indeed, affirms that the Epistles forbid the conclusion that Paul could have made so great concessions to Jewish prejudices as appears in the narrative of the Acts. But this springs from an obstinate bent, characteristic of the whole Tübingen exposition, to construct a strait-jacket for Paul, to bind him to act always according to the letter of his most spirited protests against Jewish ceremonialism. It ignores the glimpses of an irenic spirit which are given in the Epistles. We have here unmistakable intimations that Paul was ready to indulge no small measure of accommodation: "Unto the Jews," he says, "I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law" (1 Cor. ix. 20). It was in pursuance of this maxim that he caused Timothy, who had a Jewish mother, to be circumcised. Circumcision insisted upon as a necessity, he was ready to oppose with his utmost vigor, as the Epistle to the Galatians shows; but circumcision regarded as mere matter of expediency, and where the subject was of Jewish lineage, he had no scruple about practising himself. The author of the Acts really makes Paul no more Jewish than do his own Epistles. Moreover, that he did not design a perversion of the truth in order to commend the apostleship of Paul to his adversaries is indicated by the fact that he records the election of Matthias to the single vacancy in the apostolic college, a record that evidently might be just so much capital in

the hands of the opponents of the apostolic claims of Paul.[1]

One or two historical difficulties lie upon the surface of the narrative in the Acts. The date assigned to the insurrectionist Theudas is earlier, by forty years or more, than that of the insurrectionist of the same name who is described by Josephus.[2] But this is far from being proof positive of an error on the part of the author of the Acts. The mistake, if there was a mistake, may have been with Josephus. Very likely neither writer was at fault. It would be nothing strange if more than one Theudas was a leader in a seditious uprising. Names were often repeated in those times. The annals of Jewish rebellion present in a brief period no less than four with the name of Simon, and three with the name of Judas. Josephus describes Judæa

[1] This fact should be regarded as a weighty comment on the conclusion of Baur, that the mention of only twelve thrones in the Apocalypse was meant to rule out Paul from the apostolic dignity. It should also be credited with some weight against the charge that the author of the Acts purposely mutilated the history by omitting every thing counter to a mediatorial design. Baur is especially exercised over the omission of an affair of such tremendous import as Paul's reproof of Peter at Antioch, an omission whose wilful intent, as he claims, is made quite apparent by the mention of such a subordinate matter as the dispute between Paul and Barnabas. But it is to be presumed that the affair at Antioch, if viewed at all by the author of the Acts, was not viewed through the magnifying glasses of Tübingen. The proof is wanting that it was any thing more than a passing episode. Indeed, the large-heartedness of both of the apostles is not a bad guaranty that they speedily came to a good understanding. In any event, the matter had no direct bearing upon Paul's journeys. How, then, should the historian, in a rapid sketch of these journeys, be under strict obligation to turn aside to notice such an episode? The dispute with Barnabas, on the other hand, had a most palpable connection with the great missionary tour upon which Paul was just entering.

[2] Antiq., xx. 5. 1.

as being the theatre of a great number of tumults and rebellions in the disturbed era which followed the death of Herod the Great.[1] Here surely was room enough for the Theudas of the Acts. Possibly, as has been suggested, Theudas was another name for the Judas or the Simon who is mentioned by Josephus among the authors of sedition in this era. A second difficulty is the mention in the Acts of a journey to Jerusalem, by Paul, between his first visit there as a convert to Christianity and that which fell at the time of the council (xi. 30; xii. 25); whereas Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians omits all mention of such a visit. But Paul's omission may be explained from the fact that it was only a hasty journey, for the sake of carrying funds to the needy church at Jerusalem, and resulted in no intercourse of any moment with the other apostles. Paul was speaking in Galatians of the instances in which he had communicated with the apostles, and might very naturally pass by a journey which resulted in no such communication. In any case, the occasion which the Acts assign to the journey, — namely, the famine-stricken state of the brethren in Judæa, — is known from secular sources[2] to have been a fact about the time that the journey must have occurred. There is, therefore, neither in this nor in the preceding instance, any adequate ground for impeaching the truthfulness of the record.[3]

[1] Antiq., xvii. 10. [2] Josephus, Antiq., xx. 2. 5, 5. 2.

[3] Other difficulties are of course found by those who are bent upon finding them. A brief narrative cannot present every side of a transaction. Accordingly, a biassed criticism, catching a glimpse of another side than the one specially elucidated, has an opportunity to proclaim a contradiction. For example, Baur thinks it a serious discrepancy that

But let the worst possible construction of these two cases be allowed, and they will still make an exceedingly small substraction from the accuracy of the Acts of the Apostles. Its manifold and marked agreements with all other available sources, sacred or secular, proclaim it one of the most careful and trustworthy historical treatises ever composed. Let one but consider how broad was the territory covered; how varied, as respects their customs and local institutions, were the communities that are touched upon; how shifting was the political horizon of Judæa, — and the unbiassed impression cannot be other than one of admiration at the harmony of the details in the entire narrative with their geographical and historical environment.[1]

II. — FOUNDING AND SUCCESSIVE ERAS OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

On the seventh Sunday after the resurrection of Christ, the true idea of the Christian Church was for the first time realized. From the miracle of Pentecost

the Book of Acts refers to an assembly in Jerusalem convened for discussing the relation of the Gentiles to the law of Moses, whereas Paul in Galatians speaks only of conferring with the chief apostles. But the Acts do not deny the conference with the chief apostles, nor does Paul deny the assembly. That Paul should mention the more personal conference, suited his argument. What he wished to indicate to the Galatians was the independent basis of his apostleship and his full equality with the older apostles. Now, in accomplishing this, it surely would have been very little to the purpose to mention the assembly and the decree which was sent forth in its name. How he bore himself toward the chief apostles, and what acknowledgment he commanded from them, were by far the most pertinent items.

[1] "It would have been rightly considered a very trivial blot on St. Luke's accuracy if he had fallen into some slight confusion about the Ethnarch under Aretas, the Asiarchs of Ephesus, the Prætors of Phi-

issued a new creation. The invisible power and purifying agency of the Holy Spirit, symbolized by the rushing wind and tongues of fire, descended with transforming effect into the hearts of the disciples. They were brought to a new sense of their oneness with each other and with their Supreme Head. All that believed became as members of one family, and freely contributed to those in need. They had all things common. This statement, to be sure, does not necessarily imply a total renunciation of private property. That such a renunciation was not required, is clear from the language of Peter to Ananias (Acts v. 4). But the surrender of private property, in favor of a common fund, was at least sufficiently general to be a noteworthy characteristic of the new Christian community. As the Church expanded to wider limits, this order of things very properly came to an end. It should be viewed, however, as a significant image of the charity and large-heartedness which ought perpetually to characterize the Church.

As the child is born into a certain unavoidable de-

lippi, the Politarchs of Thessalonica, the Protos of Malta, or the question whether Proprætor or Proconsul was, in the numerous changes of those days, the exact official title of the Roman governor of Cyprus or Corinth. On several of these points he has been triumphantly charged with ignorance and error; and on all these points his minute exactitude has been completely vindicated or rendered extremely probable. In every historical allusion — as, for instance, the characters of Gallio, Felix, Festus, Agrippa II., Ananias, the famine in the days of Claudius, the decree to expel Jews from Rome, the death of Agrippa I., the rule of Aretas at Damascus, the Italian band, etc. — he has been shown to be perfectly faithful to facts." (F. W. FARRAR, *Life and Work of St. Paul*, vol. i., chap. 6.) See Paley's Horæ Paulinæ; Life of St. Paul, by Conybeare and Howson; Harman's Introduction to the Scriptures; Ebrard's Kritik der Evangelische Geschichte; Lechler's Apostolische und Nachapostolische Zeitalter.

pendence upon established conditions, so was it with Christianity. Whatever new facts of faith and life it possessed, it found itself in the old established household of Judaism. Of necessity there was still a certain affiliation with Judaism. The first disciples followed many Jewish customs. A superficial observer would have perceived in them scarcely more than a new Jewish sect. Even by the disciples themselves, the way out of the old national restrictions was but dimly discerned. It was only gradually that they came to the clear consciousness that men could become Christians without in any wise becoming Jews, or passing through the gateway of Jewish rites.

From the circumstances of the case, it followed that the first stage of development in the Church was a process of separation from Judaism. A sudden and violent severance would have been as unfitting as unnatural. Judaism had served as a forerunner of Christianity. It had provided the household in which this child of Heaven was born. Before the distinction between Jew and Gentile should vanish forever, it was becoming that an ample offer of the gospel should be made to the Jews. Even had the apostles had the clearest light upon the relation of Christianity to Judaism, it would not have been wisdom for them to have proceeded very differently from what they did. The course actually pursued bears the most evident tokens of providential guidance. Step followed step in natural order toward the final result. The appointment of liberal-minded Hellenists to the office of deacons; the scattering of the Church by persecution; the preaching of Philip in Samaria; the forming of a new Christian

centre at Antioch; the baptism of Cornelius and his household by Peter; and, finally, the transforming of the strictest and most persecuting Pharisee into the most liberal apostle to the Gentiles, — were so many successive steps away from the restrictions of Judaism, and toward an acknowledgment of the independent and universal character of Christianity. This end was closely approximated as early as the council at Jerusalem (A.D. 50–52). To be sure, even after that date, there was a narrow-minded party in the Church, that leaned toward Judaism. But from the time of the council, the authoritative verdict of the Church declared the Gentiles eligible to all the privileges of Christianity, without submitting to circumcision, or being subject in general to the ceremonial law (Acts xv. 20, 29).

In the next stage of development, the great fact was missionary activity in the Gentile world. The Church extended her borders far and wide within the Roman Empire. Then followed a third stage, marked, indeed, by continued missionary activity, but also distinguished by special attention to the organization and inner life of the churches previously established. Thus we have three periods in the apostolic age, — the first extending to the middle of the century; the second to the death of Paul (64–68); the third to the death of John, near the close of the century. Each of these periods had its own prominent leader, from whom its developments received a special impulse. Using the terms with proper limitations, we might name the several periods the Petrine, the Pauline, and the Johannine.

III.—THE CHIEF APOSTLES.

1. PETER.—In the first stage of the apostolic history, Peter was unquestionably the leading spirit. Naturally his impulsiveness was in excess of his steadfastness; but this disproportion had largely been rectified by a stern discipline and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. He stood before the multitude on the Day of Pentecost as a man pre-eminently fitted for command. His boldness and confidence, his enthusiasm and readiness of speech, gave him a special aptitude for leadership. He belonged to the men powerful in execution, rather than to those deep and comprehensive in thought; to the class of Ambrose, Gregory the Great, and Gregory VII., rather than to the class of Paul, Augustine, and Anselm. He had less of deep intuition or spiritual insight than John, but he had more of those qualities which stir men to heroic confidence and zeal. More than any other, he was qualified to animate the feeble band of the early disciples, and lead them on in the face of Jewish hatred, opposition, and violence.

It was with reference to these qualities, and the work that should result from them, that Christ addressed to His apostle the strong language which we find in Matt. xvi. 18: "I say unto thee that thou art Peter (or rock), and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."[1] This was a

[1] The change from πέτρος in the first clause to πέτρα in the second cannot fairly be credited with the significance which has sometimes been attached to it in Protestant polemics. In the Aramaic, which Christ probably used, the word for the *person* is identical with the word for the *material*. The change in the Greek is accounted for by the fact,

prophecy of the undeniable fact, that, in the first stage of its history, and upon Jewish soil, the Church was built upon Peter as upon no other human agent. The first chapters of Acts are an adequate commentary on the passage, showing, as they do, the great apostle accomplishing a work of foundation against which the gates of hell evidently shall never prevail. But while a fair exegesis must attach this much of meaning to the words of Christ, it is in nowise authorized to attach to them any further meaning. They bespeak for Peter no other pre-eminence than that which is found in the degree and effectiveness of his labors in the first stage of apostolic history. They assign to him no solitary function, but one in which the other apostles shared, though for the most part in less conspicuous degree. This is absolutely clear from the general course of New-Testament representation. We find here that, on the divine side, Christ is the foundation, and the sole foundation, of the Church. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. iii. 11). Viewed on the human side, all the apostles, and, indeed, all eminent confessors, enter into the foundation. "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone" (Eph. ii. 20). That on a particular occasion Christ made special mention of Peter does not exclude the others from the foundation. He made special men-

that, while πέτρα was most suited to the idea which was to be expressed, πέτρος alone was customarily used as a personal term. Hence the latter is employed in immediate conjunction with the address to the person; while in the following clause the idea finds its proper expression in the impersonal term.

tion of Peter in order to fulfil the special occasion which his noble confession had given for rewarding him. Had there been a like occasion for prophesying over Paul, our Lord might have said to him with equal or even greater emphasis: Thou art a rock, and upon this rock will I build my Church. Indeed, Paul appears as the great founder upon Gentile soil; and so much more extensive was his work than that of Peter, that he might almost be regarded as the typical founder of the Christian Church, even as David overshadowed Saul, and came to be regarded as the great head of the Jewish monarchy.[1]

It is only by a species of exegetical magic that the Romish theory of the primacy can be gotten out of the passage in Matthew. Between assigning Peter a foremost part in founding the church at *Jerusalem*, and ordaining him to a perpetual incarnation in a succession of bishops at *Rome*, there is an immeasurable gulf. To bridge over this gulf, and to establish its theory of the papacy, Romanism is obliged to introduce a whole mass of assumptions. (1) It assumes that a constitutional primacy, or a primacy of governing authority over the

[1] There is really no motive, on Protestant grounds, to deny that Christ spoke of Peter as a foundation, provided the proper considerations are added: namely (1), the tenor of the New Testament makes it perfectly plain that the words in Matthew were not applied to Peter in an exclusive sense, and denote only that he was a conspicuous stone in the foundation; (2) to be a foundation means, in connection with any human agent, only to do the work of a founder; (3) the office of a founder is not a thing of inheritance or transmission. One can build upon the foundation laid by Peter. One can even imitate in a measure Peter's work by planting Christianity in new regions. But proper succession is out of question. As well think of a continuous succession of founders of the American Republic as of any one being heir to Peter's place in the foundation of the Church.

whole Church, was vested in Peter from the outset. But where is the evidence for such a primacy? Not a trace of it can be found in the New Testament. The only primacy which is there ascribed to Peter is that of personal influence, the primacy which is always claimed by superior abilities, just such as commanding talents might give to one member of a parliament or senate; this member, meanwhile, standing precisely on a par with his colleagues as respects constitutional authority. In point of constitutional prerogatives, Peter appears in no wise distinguished from the other apostles. All important matters are settled by the whole college of apostles, or, wider still, by the whole Christian assembly; as in the election of an apostle in the place of Judas, in the election of deacons, and in the decision upon the question of circumcision. Not a solitary instance is on record in which Peter is represented as acting as supreme governor of the Church. Paul in none of his Epistles betrays the slightest consciousness that he was amenable to the authority of Peter. On the contrary, he takes pains to convince the mischief-making faction among the Galatians that his commission from Jesus Christ was such as to put him on a full equality with the apostle of the circumcision. (2) Romanism assumes that this (imagined) constitutional authority of Peter was transmitted by him to a single successor. For this, too, there is no proper historical warrant: it is unproved assumption. (3) Romanism assumes that this successor to the constitutional primacy of Peter was the Bishop of Rome. But why the Bishop of Rome rather than the Bishop of Jerusalem or of Antioch? It is not to be taken as a matter of course

that Peter would transmit his authority to the Bishop of Rome. The New Testament does not so much as give us a single unmistakable intimation that Peter was ever in Rome; and, even if the reality of such a visit be allowed, his connection with the church at Rome remains before the eyes of history a dim and misty thing compared with his connection with the church at Jerusalem. There is nothing in the nature of the case to assure us that Peter would fix upon the Bishop of Rome. All that the nature of the case assures us is, that the *Bishop of Rome*, being favored by the associations of the imperial city, the mistress of the world, would be likely, ere long, to constitute *himself* a successor of Peter, and to assert his fictitious claims with a good degree of success. The Roman theory runs here into the region of pure assumption, and impinges, moreover, upon a very considerable incongruity. Supposing Peter to have been the first Bishop of Rome, his immediate successor was Linus, a man so obscure that only his name has been preserved to us; yet the papal theory requires us to picture the Apostle John, and all other living apostles, as subject to the authority of this person. (4) Romanism assumes that a constitutional primacy over the whole Church has been transmitted through a line of Roman bishops down to the present. Thus, no less than four unmitigated assumptions must be added to the facts of history to make out the Roman theory of the primacy.[1]

[1] The utter weakness of Romish apologetics on these fundamental points is apparent at a glance into any standard work which undertakes the defence of the papal theory. Sweeping assumption is the approved means with which to bridge over the great chasms in the evidence.

After the apostolic council at Jerusalem, history ceases almost entirely to give us any references to Peter. From the Epistle to the Galatians, we learn that he was in Antioch for a season. In his own Epistle, he sends to the churches of Asia Minor the greetings of the church at Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13). By Babylon, in this connection, some have understood a mystical name for Rome. This interpretation is supported by such considerations as the following: (1) Babylon appears to be used in this sense in Sibylline verses supposed to be of early date.[1] (2) Some of the Fathers of the second century understood that Peter used the term in this sense.[2] (3) No tradition has been handed down respecting the labors of Peter at Babylon. (4) The waste condition of Babylon at this time renders it improbable that it was a theatre either of apostolic residence or labor. (5) The Epistle of Peter indicates acquaintanceship with Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, which was written about A.D. 63; consequently, if Peter perished in the Neronian persecution, the distance between the Western capital and the far East must have been traversed and re-traversed within a very brief period. But, to each of these considerations, a reply is not

Thus, Archbishop Kenrick, in his work on the primacy of the Holy See, remarks, "From the fact that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome at the time of his martyrdom, it follows that his successors in this see are heirs of his apostolic authority." It follows, as will be shown presently, only in the view of those who are determined that it should follow. But it is said the testimony of the Fathers supports the heirship of the Roman bishop. Then do not state as a necessary inference what is dependent upon testimony. How far the testimony of the Fathers is from making out the case for the primacy, will appear in the proper connection.

[1] V. 143, 159. [2] Euseb., Hist. Eccl., ii. 15.

wanting. It remains to be proved that the association of the name Babylon with Rome did not take its rise from the figurative language of the Apocalypse, and therefore subsequent to the composition of Peter's epistle. That there should be no tradition about the sojourn of Peter at Babylon, finds a parallel in the absence of reference to the lives of the other apostles. Moreover, in any case, there is a long blank in Peter's history, and the more Eastern district might as well have failed to perpetuate the account of the apostle's doings as any other region. As to the waste condition of Babylon, it is not certain that the city was totally uninhabited at the precise time the epistle was written; and, besides, Peter may have used the name of the ancient metropolis, as did Philo,[1] to designate, not merely the city, but the Babylonian district. The improbability that Peter should have become acquainted with a late writing of Paul,[2] and still have had time to journey from Babylon to Rome before the date of his martyrdom, ceases to be an improbability when one relinquishes the unproved assumption that the apostle was martyred at the crisis of the Neronian persecution in the year 64. His death may have fallen two or three years later. We are left, then, without decisive grounds for a verdict. There is a certain presumption against the supposition, that, in a plain prose composition, a figurative name for Rome should have been employed. Such a usage, however, was not impossible; and ade-

[1] F. W. Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, Excursus iii.

[2] It is not conceded by all critics that Peter's epistle gives certain evidence of acquaintance with that of Paul to the Ephesians. See Harman's Introduction.

quate evidence as to its currency at the time, if it were only forthcoming, might establish a measure of probability that it was adopted by Peter in his communication to the Asiatic churches.[1]

The reference to Babylon, then, is far from deciding whether Peter was in Rome, and we must look to other evidences. Here belong the following facts: (1) No other place claimed the glory of Peter's martyrdom. (2) A letter of Ignatius to the Romans,[2] in the early part of the second century, takes it for granted that Peter had been in communication with them. His words, however, "Not as Peter and Paul do I issue commandments to you," do not necessarily imply a personal visitation. (3) Dionysius, who was Bishop of Corinth about the year 170, speaks of both Peter and Paul as having preached and suffered martyrdom in Italy.[3] (4) Irenæus testifies that Peter and Paul preached in Rome, and were instrumental in founding and building up the Church there.[4] (5) Several contemporaries of Irenæus, such as the Roman presbyter Caius,[5] Clement of Alexandria,[6] and Tertullian,[7] take it for granted that Peter had labored at Rome. The first of these points to a visible confirmation of the fact that Rome had been honored by the labors and the martyrdom of the great apostles. "I can show," he says, "the monuments of the apostles; for, if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian Road, you will find the monuments of those who have laid the foundation

[1] Ewald says that to designate Rome as Babylon had long been common in Jewish-Christian circles; but, unfortunately, he does not add the proof. (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. vi., 2d ed., p. 623.)

[2] Chap. iv. [3] Euseb., ii. 25. [4] Cont. Hær., iii. 3, 3.

[5] Euseb., ii. 25. [6] Euseb., vi. 14. [7] De Præscrip. Hær., xxxvi.

of this Church." A part of this testimony is weakened by uncritical or unhistorical adjuncts. Dionysius, for example, associates Peter with Paul in the founding of the Corinthian Church; and Tertullian adds to his account of the death of the two apostles at Rome the representation that John was plunged there into boiling oil before being sent into exile. Still the absence of any rival claim, and the voice of early tradition, while they do not suffice for certainty, establish a probability that Rome was the theatre of Peter's closing labors and martyrdom.

Although it may be granted that Peter was in Rome, it is not to be assumed that he was there any great length of time. The statement which Jerome reports on the authority of Eusebius, that Peter was in Rome twenty-five years (42–67), is mixed up with the fabulous stories of the apostle's contests with Simon Magus.[1] In the light of New Testament data, such a statement is simply preposterous. The evidence, negative and positive, which may be urged against it is conclusive. (1) There are substantial indications that the martyrdom of James, the brother of John, occurred in the year 44. Peter, therefore, as being imprisoned by Herod Agrippa directly after the death of James, was not in Rome at that date. (2) Peter was in Jerusalem at the apostolic council, about the year 50. In the report of that council, not a word is said about his having been at Rome. Certainly he had not preached the gospel to the Gentile population of that city, else he would have had something more than the baptism of Cornelius to refer to as a justification of his position on the subject of circum-

[1] Euseb., ii. 13–15.

cision. (3) At some time, probably not very long, after the council, Peter, as we learn from the Epistle to the Galatians, was at Antioch. (4) The Epistle of Paul to the Romans was written about the year 58. In this epistle Paul gives not the slightest hint that he was writing to a church in which Peter had labored. In a whole list of salutations he includes not a single reference to his co-apostle. (5) Paul arrived a prisoner at Rome about the year 61. Among the brethren who were there to greet him, no mention is made of Peter. (6) The chief of the Jews whom Paul called together at Rome spoke as though they had not had any ample opportunity to learn about the Christians. "We desire," they said to Paul, "to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for as concerning this sect we know that everywhere it is spoken against" (Acts xxviii. 22). Now, it is not to be credited that they would have used such language if the great apostle of the circumcision had been preaching in Rome for nearly a score of years. Such facts as these must be allowed vastly more weight than the fables about Peter's conflicts with Simon Magus, which were concocted in the second century. In short, Peter's sojourn in Rome was probably for a limited period between the years 63 and 68.[1]

The stay of Peter in Rome, whether longer or shorter, has properly very little connection with the doctrine of the primacy. His being in the city is no guaranty that he served as bishop there. Indeed, the proof is quite ample, that the office of bishop, as distinct from that of presbyter, had no existence in Peter's day. And

[1] It is to be noticed that Lactantius speaks as though Peter first came to Rome in the reign of Nero. (*De Mort. Persecut.*, ii.)

even if he did serve as bishop, this was only the exer cise of a local office, in addition to the universal office which pertained to him as apostle; and it would not follow at all that the successors in the local office would inherit the functions of the universal office. As well might it be concluded, that, if a bishop should condescend temporarily to perform the duties of a pastor of a local church, the next and all subsequent pastors of that church would hold the rank of bishops.

Concerning the martyrdom of Peter, we have, aside from the prophecy of Christ (John xxi. 18–19), nothing but the reports of tradition. An early legend narrates that, on the eve of his sacrifice, his love of life gained the victory over the spirit of confession. He started to leave Rome, when lo! he was arrested by the appearance of his Master bearing the cross. "Lord, whither art thou going?" asked the astonished disciple. "I am going to Rome, to be crucified again," was the reply. Peter felt the reproof, went back to the city, and cheerfully accepted the martyr's portion. According to a tradition recorded by Origen, he was crucified with his head downwards.[1]

Of the two Epistles ascribed to Peter, the genuineness of the first is strongly approved by external evidence, and offers no real ground of attack as respects internal evidences.[2] The early Church received it

[1] Euseb., iii. 1.

[2] The claim of Schwegler and Hilgenfeld, that the time of Trajan alone suits the reference to persecution contained in the epistle, is perfectly gratuitous. Paul's catalogue of his painful experiences, as given in Second Corinthians, is a sufficient indication that a Christian in that age did not need to wait for a formal edict of a Roman emperor, before finding occasion to endure hardship and violence.

without dispute. There are substantial indications that it was used by Polycarp and Papias. It is acknowledged as the composition of Peter by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and Eusebius. The Second Epistle can quote far less of external evidence in its favor. Only a few probable, and still fewer certain, references to it can be found in the writings of the first three centuries. Eusebius places it among the doubtful books.[1] Many critics hold that the internal evidence forbids its assignment to Peter.[2]

2. PAUL. — As fitly as Peter represents the morn of the apostolic age, Paul represents its noon-day. The one reveals to us what the grace of Christ could make out of a fisherman, the other what that grace could fashion out of a cultured Pharisee.

In Paul we find a nature quite as ardent and intense as that of Peter. These qualities, however, were supplemented in Paul in such wise as to make him a very different character from the apostle of the circumcision. With the warm impulses of the heart, he joined great logical power and intellectual breadth. History presents but rare instances of men who have exhibited such a wide range of abilities as appeared in the apostle to the Gentiles. In point of metaphysical aptitude and subtle reasoning, he might be termed the true scholastic; at

[1] Hist. Eccl., iii. 25.

[2] A compromise theory is sketched as follows by F. W. Farrar: "I believe there is much to support the conclusion that we have not here the words and style of the great apostle, but that he lent to this epistle the sanction of his name and the assistance of his advice. If this be so, it is still in its main essence genuine as well as canonical, and there is reason both for its peculiarities and for its tardy reception." (*Early Days of Christianity*, Book II., chap. ix.)

the same time, he had a sensibility and spiritual depth which made him scarcely less the true mystic. The finished scholar, at least as respects Jewish lore, he was also the man of extraordinary practical activity and administrative talent. While he was engaged in great enterprises, and was organizing churches over the breadth of an empire, he was still able to remember individuals of his various flocks, and appended to the grandest of his Epistles numerous expressions of special and affectionate regard. For work or for suffering, he was equally ready; and, almost beyond example, his life abounded in both.

One source of this breadth of character was doubtless a correspondingly wide experience. As the strict and conscientious Pharisee, he lived through the old dispensation of law and ceremony. As the apostle to the Gentiles, passing far beyond the bounds of Judaism, he lived through the new dispensation of life and freedom. As persecutor and then as persecuted, he was placed in the most diverse positions. In short, his experience fitted him in a peculiar degree to understand his age, and to address himself to its wants with wide-reaching versatility.

Paul was born in Tarsus, in Cilicia.[1] This was "no mean city" at that time. Both in material and literary respects, it was a flourishing emporium. Strabo makes it the rival of Athens and Alexandria in point of philosophy and general culture.[2] How much Paul imbibed

[1] The use of "Paul" for the earlier appearing "Saul" is not explained. It may have belonged to him as a second name, or been chosen as a Hellenistic substitute for Saul.

[2] Geography, xiv. 5. At the same time he adds, "The studious are all natives, and strangers are not inclined to resort thither." A less

from this culture, is a question which cannot be answered with entire definiteness. His own statement, as recorded in Acts xxii. 3, indicates that he was early inducted into the study of the law at Jerusalem. We know also that it became a maxim among the Jews, that the study of the law should be commenced at the age of thirteen. The probability is, therefore, that Paul became occupied with Hebrew learning before he had traversed, to any great extent, the field of classic literature. In after years, we may presume, that, for the sake of more complete adaptation to the field of his apostolic labors, he gave some attention to the Greek writers. We find him quoting from several of the poets; namely, Aratus or Cleanthes,[1] Menander,[2] and Epimenides.[3] But at this stage he came to such sources as one interested in subject-matter, rather than in form. He consulted them, not as literary models, but as supplying means for introducing and commending the gospel message. To the end, Paul was more a student of the Old Testament than of Greek poetry, more a disciple of Gamaliel than of Aristotle. While he transcended the traditional Judaism completely in the breadth of his spirit, he continued, so far as the drapery of thought and argument were concerned, to draw from the Jewish wardrobe.

Paul carried from Tarsus a title to Roman citizenship. This, however, was an inheritance from his family, rather than a dower from his city. While Tarsus was a free city, citzenship did not pertain to its inhabitants as a body.

flattering reference to the people of Tarsus is given in the work of Philostratus, De Vita Apollonii Tyanensis, i. 7.

[1] Acts xvii. 28. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 33. [3] Titus i. 12.

At Jerusalem Paul received no ordinary tuition. His teacher, Gamaliel, was a celebrated master, the great oracle of the school of Hillel. As appears from the narrative in the Acts, Gamaliel was not under the sole influence of Pharisaic bigotry, and was capable of acting with exemplary moderation. But there is no reason to doubt that he cherished a deep enthusiasm for the law, and that his teaching was well suited to kindle in the intense soul of the young disciple from Tarsus a burning zeal, — a zeal which, unchastened by age and experience, would naturally be more intolerant than that by which it had been incited. So Paul became a zealot — not a superficial enthusiast, but a genuine zealot — for the law. To the best of his ability he strove to keep its requirements. Though he found it a hard master, an instrument of rebuke rather than of healing, he still enthroned it in his reverence, and was ready to take vengeance upon the sacrilegious hand which should dare to assail its supremacy. As his ability was well-nigh as conspicuous as his zeal, he naturally advanced toward leadership in the ranks of the Pharisees. It appears probable that he became a member of the Sanhedrin.[1] It is entirely certain that he was a trusted agent in the policy of repression to which the Sanhedrin was impelled as the powerful preaching of the

[1] If the statement in Acts xxvi. 10, which represents Paul as voting for the death of Christians, is taken in a judicial sense, the inference is tolerably clear that Paul belonged to the supreme tribunal. This is a conclusion, it may be added, which has an interest as bearing not only upon Paul's public station, but upon his domestic relations as well. If he was a member of the Sanhedrin, it is probable that he was a married man. In his apostolic labors Paul appears as unmarried. But there is nothing in the New Testament which forbids the supposition that he may have been a widower.

Christian deacons began to produce a marked impression.

In the New-Testament history, Paul appears for the first time upon the stage as the witness and abetter of Stephen's martyrdom. That scene, we may presume, never left his mind, and served as one factor in bringing about his conversion (Acts xxii. 20). The memory of the martyr's looks and dying prayer could not be banished, even while he was breathing out threatenings and slaughter, and was pursuing the Christians to distant cities. Augustine had some ground for his saying, "If Stephen had not prayed, the Church had not had Paul." The beginning of positive conviction came, indeed, with the clear revelation of Jesus Christ, the light above the brightness of the sun which shone upon the plain of Damascus; but we may well imagine prior to that crisis a certain inward ferment, a secret, suppressed questioning, which prepared the persecutor rightly to receive the heavenly vision.

A more thorough conquest was never made by Christianity. Head and heart alike were transformed. The narrow view of the rigid Pharisee expanded to the world-wide vision of the liberal apostle. Judaism appeared henceforth only as the forerunner and prophecy of Christianity. The form more luminous than the sun caused every rival form to disappear. The name which had been blasphemed was exalted above every name. All thought of personal gain now centred in Jesus of Nazareth. All estimate of human need and privilege, all motive to labor, took shape from the crucified and risen Christ. Missionary zeal was no common humanitarian impulse in the converted Paul. The

thought that he was fulfilling the pleasure of Christ, even more than the obvious needs of men, urged him forward in the pathway of suffering and sacrifice. Love to Christ was the primary and fundamental incentive, an unselfish love for men being the outflow of a sympathetic union with Him who gave Himself for men. In a word, the life of Paul became, in the completest sense imaginable, a Christo-centric life. Marvellous change from intensest hatred to boundless, all-controlling love! How frivolous appears every naturalistic explanation! Paul himself gives the explanation which makes the least demand upon a rational faith. The actual revelation of Jesus Christ was the only cause commensurate with the result.[1]

Paul's conversion may be placed about the year 37.[2] Forthwith, conforming conduct to conviction, after receiving the friendly offices of Ananias, he confessed his new Master in the rite of baptism. It is possible

[1] It is noteworthy that Baur, in his latest references to the conversion of Paul, confesses, if not the objective miracle, a profound mystery in the inner experience of the apostle which he is not disinclined to call a miracle. (*Kirchengeschichte*, vol i., p. 45.)

[2] This conclusion presupposes, (1) that the council of Jerusalem was held in the year 50 or 51; (2) that the journey mentioned in Gal. ii. 1 was identical with that described in Acts as Paul's third visit to Jerusalem, the one in which he attended the council; (3) that the fourteen years mentioned in Gal. ii. 1 are to be reckoned from Paul's conversion. The first supposition is made probable by reckoning back from subsequent points in the apostle's history. The second is strongly commended as being most in accord with the sum total of New-Testament data. See Schaff, History of the Apostolic Church; Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, note at end of chap. vii., vol. i. The third supposition is not entirely certain; but it seems most natural to infer that Paul made the great crisis in his life, rather than his first visit to Jerusalem, the point of departure in his reckoning. If this be denied, the conversion of Paul must be located at least as early as A.D. 35.

also that he declared his Christian faith in the form of public testimony and argument. The fact of his withdrawal into Arabia may have been due to a fanatical opposition, on the part of the Jews, called forth by the effective teaching of the new convert. But it is more probable that Paul proceeded with a measure of reserve at first, and that he retired of his own choice, wishing to find a more quiet theatre for thought and labor than could be enjoyed where he had been known as a most zealous champion of Judaism, and was now denounced and hated as the worst of apostates. How little opportunity Damascus afforded for a peaceful ministry, was shown upon his return, after an absence of two or three years.[1] Unable to withstand him in argument, the Jews resorted to schemes of violence. As they gained the ear of the Ethnarch, who commanded the city for the Arabian king Aretas, Paul was compelled to have recourse to flight (Acts ix. 22–25; 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33). He now made the first of his recorded visits to Jerusalem, where he was introduced to the older apostles through the good offices of Barnabas, and by a vision in the temple received a new affirmation of his mission to the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 21). Eluding the plots of the mortal enemies who were on the watch for him in the Jewish capital, he set out, after a stay of only fifteen days, for his native city in Cilicia. During the uncertain interval which he spent

[1] That Luke omits the comparatively uneventful sojourn in Arabia, and passes at once to Paul's preaching in Damascus, and his enforced departure from that city, is sufficiently explained by the brevity which characterizes his narrative in general, and especially that part of it belonging to the time before he became the travelling companion of the apostle.

here, he was probably engaged in preaching. Next we find him laboring for a year in Antioch,[1] from which place he made his second visit to Jerusalem, bearing thither, in conjunction with Barnabas, a contribution for the poor and famine-stricken brethren.

Returning to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas began thence their first great missionary tour. They passed through the whole length of the Island of Cyprus, winning among other trophies the conversion of the proconsul Sergius Paulus. From Cyprus the missionaries crossed over to Asia Minor. According to their fixed principle, in each city they visited, they entered the synagogue, and first made an offer of the gospel to the Jews before extending their preaching to the Gentiles. They visited Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe; then turning upon their course, they revisited the congregations which they had established, embarked from Attaleia, and sailed back toward Antioch in Syria. To us this circuit appears as an illuminated pathway, a line of gospel light cast out into the Gentile world. To the apostle, like his course in general, it was a pathway along which the light of glorious victories was mixed with the shadows of great afflictions.

After spending a considerable interval in Antioch, Paul went for a third time to Jerusalem, having occasion, in the dissension which had arisen on the question of circumcision, to confer with the apostles. Provided

[1] An indication that Christianity had become at this time a conspicuous fact in Antioch is given in the distinctive name of "Christians" which was now applied to its adherents. This name was probably first employed by Gentile outsiders, rather than by Christians themselves or by the Jews.

with the decision of the apostolic council, which harmonized with the demands of his work among the Gentiles, Paul returned to Antioch. In consequence of a disagreement with Barnabas about the propriety of taking Mark with them, he left him to pursue his separate course, and in company with Silas began his second great missionary journey. The churches already established in Syria and Asia Minor were visited, and the foundations were laid for new ones in Phrygia and Galatia. At Lystra Paul met Timothy, destined to become distinguished as the companion of his labors, — "the Melanchthon of the apostolic Luther," as he is called by Pressensé. From Troas, where it is presumed Luke was added to his company, Paul crossed over, as directed by a vision of the night, into Macedonia, and began the conquest of the European continent. Churches were planted in Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea. The headquarters of Greek learning and license were invaded, and foundation-stones of a new civilization were laid at Athens and Corinth. Paul remained in the latter city not less than a year and a half, during which time he wrote his two Epistles to the Thessalonians. At the expiration of his Corinthian sojourn, he made a fourth visit to Jerusalem, touching at Ephesus on his way.

Returning once more to his headquarters in Antioch, Paul started thence, about the year 54, upon his third great missionary tour. After passing through Galatia and Phrygia, he came to Ephesus, where his own passing visit and the recent labors of Aquila, Priscilla, and Apollos had prepared a certain number of disciples. Here he abode, with perhaps some intermissions, for

about three years. During this period he wrote what is commonly termed the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which, however, was preceded by an epistle that has not been preserved (1 Cor. v. 9). The Epistle to the Galatians may have been written during the same interval; still, it is not certain that it was written before the sojourn at Corinth, which Paul made soon after leaving Ephesus. On his way to Corinth, Paul visited Macedonia, and sent thence his Second Epistle to the Corinthians. During the three months which he spent at Corinth and its vicinity, he wrote the Epistle to the Romans.

Paul now set his face toward Jerusalem for the fifth time since his conversion. Having passed through Macedonia, and halted for a little time at Troas, he met the Ephesian elders at Miletus, from which point he sailed to Tyre, and, passing down the coast through Ptolemais and Cæsarea, came to Jerusalem. Here followed a speedy fulfilment of the prophecies which had met him on his way, assuring him that bonds and imprisonment awaited him. Beset by a bloodthirsty mob of Jews, he was saved only by the interference of the commander of the garrison in the tower of Antonia, who sent him to the procurator Felix at Cæsarea, in order to place him beyond the reach of Jewish conspiracy. The lax and unprincipled Felix kept Paul a prisoner for two years. Under his successor Festus, the apostle, in pursuance of his appeal to Cæsar, was sent to Rome, having first proclaimed the gospel to Herod Agrippa II. and his royal company. Here he remained in easy confinement, having, as Luke says, his own hired house for the space of two whole years (Acts

xxviii. 30). During this time he wrote his Epistles to Philemon, the Ephesians, the Philippians, and the Colossians.[1]

Was Paul released from this imprisonment at Rome, and enabled to make another missionary tour before he was finally brought to the block? While this question has been answered in the negative by some eminent critics, evangelical scholarship in recent times has turned with increasing conviction toward an affirmative conclusion. Among the grounds for such a conclusion are the following: (1) Paul himself cherished a strong confidence that he should be released from his impris-

[1] Some modern critics have assigned this list of Epistles to the Cæsarean captivity, instead of the Roman. This is counter, not only to tradition, but to the internal evidence of the writings. Rome is identified as the point of departure by the following facts: 1. The salutation of Cæsar's household (iv. 22) indicates that Philippians was written in Rome. 2. Timothy is not known to have been with Paul in the Cæsarean captivity. He was with Paul at his writing of Philippians (i. 1), and also at the writing of Colossians (i. 1). The inference is, therefore, that Colossians was written in Rome. 3. The hint respecting the apostle's opportunities, while a prisoner, for religious labor (Col. iv. 3, 4) corresponds to his position at Rome as given in Acts xxviii. 30, 31. 4. The parallel lists of names in Colossians (chap. iv) and Philemon show unmistakably that these two letters were written at the same time. In Philemon, Paul speaks of his expectation of soon visiting Asia Minor. But we know from other sources (Acts xix. 21, xx. 25, xxiii. 11; Rom. i. 13, xv. 28) that at the time of the Cæsarean captivity his face was set, not toward Asia Minor, but toward Rome. Hence an additional evidence is given that Colossians, as well as Philemon, was written from Rome. 5. Tychicus, who is designated as the bearer of the letter to the Colossians (iv. 7, 8), was also the bearer of the letter to the Ephesians (vi. 21). Moreover, it is not improbable that the so-called letter to the Ephesians was a circular letter, intended to be first delivered to the church of Laodicea, and so identical with that mentioned in Col. iv. 16. We have the very positive testimony of Basil that the earlier manuscripts did not contain the name of Ephesus or of any particular church. So Rome is also sufficiently indicated as the point of departure for the Epistle to the Ephesians.

onment (Phil. i. 25–26, ii. 24; Philem. 22). Indeed, he felt so sure of this that he requested that a lodging should be provided for himself. Now, it is possible that Paul was mistaken: but his language indicates, that, if he judged after the manner of men, his relation with the government was such as to promise release; if he judged after the Spirit, he of course judged rightly. That a man whose life was so fully under the guidance of God should judge after the Spirit, is intrinsically probable. In any case, his strong confidence creates more or less of a probability on the side of his release. (2) Clement of Rome, a reputed disciple of Paul, and in any case an author of the first century, says of the apostle, that he instructed the whole world in righteousness and came to the *extremity of the West.*[1] Such an expression would not naturally be used of Rome by one who was writing in that city. Even the stand-point of those addressed, if he wished to accommodate himself to that, would not authorize it, for Clement was writing to the Corinthians; and, to a party no farther east than Corinth, Rome would not appear as the extremity of the West. The expression applies most naturally to Spain, a visit to which entered into the plan of Paul (Rom. xv. 28). The accomplishment of such a visit implies, of course, release from the first imprisonment under Nero. (3) The so-called Canon of Muratori, written by a Christian about 170, assumes the visit to Spain. The same is taken for granted by Eusebius, Chrysostom, Jerome, and the early Church in general. The Spanish Christians, it is true, seem not to have preserved any tradition respecting the work

[1] Epist. ad. Corinth., v.

of Paul in their country. But this is sufficiently explained by the total lack of record or reminiscence of early Christianity in Spain. "The tradition of the Spanish Church," says Döllinger, "reaches no farther back than the third century; no Spanish Christian wrote any thing before the end of the fourth."[1] That there should be a gap in the history of Paul's labors, cannot properly be a source of surprise, when no word is on record respecting the entire work of other apostles. (4) The Pastoral Epistles — namely, those to Timothy and Titus — favor the supposition of a release from the first imprisonment. Their general subject-matter is on the side of this conclusion. As no other writings of Paul, they evince in him a painful consciousness of the presence of Gnostic notions, a fact eminently in accordance with the theory that they were the latest of his Epistles, and were based upon personal observation and renewed intercourse with the churches. Again, they contain specific statements which indicate that Paul must have been out of prison and in the East subsequent to the first Roman confinement. The apostle, in his Epistle to Titus, speaks of leaving the latter in Crete (i. 5). Now, we have no hint that Paul labored upon that island before he went to Rome. On his journey to Rome, the ship stopped in a Cretan harbor for a considerable time, but no mention is made of any brethren being there to send their greetings or to receive those of the apostle. The facts at least suggest, if they do not prove, a missionary tour to Crete subsequent to the Roman sojourn. In the Second Epistle to Timothy (iv. 13), Paul requests the bringing

[1] First Age of the Church, trans. by H. N. Oxenham, 2d ed., p. 79.

of a cloak, some books, and parchments from Troas. Such a request is more natural on the supposition that he had recently been in Troas, than on the theory that he had not been near the place within six or seven years, as must have been the case if he had not been released from Rome. Finally, the statement, "Erastus abode at Corinth, but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick," (2 Tim. iv. 20) is utterly strange and inexplicable on the opposing theory. Think of Paul bringing forward such an item of information a half dozen years after the events referred to! Against these arguments, there is little or nothing to be urged except the fact that the great Neronian persecution took place in the year 64, too soon, therefore, to admit of an extensive missionary tour between Paul's release and that fierce onslaught. But the assumption that Paul perished in the heat of that persecution is quite gratuitous. As Tacitus testifies, there was a wide-spread and intense hatred of the Christians. This could easily stimulate at any time to accusations against individual Christians; and, under the existing circumstances, accusations would naturally be followed by death.

In the Second Epistle to Timothy, Paul sent forth his last testament to the world. Before him lay the ordeal of martyrdom.[1] It was, however, a far different scene which rose upon his vision as he wrote to his beloved disciple. His mind was forecasting, not the exit from Rome and the journey to a bloody death, but a triumphal entrance into the heavenly city and a summons to a coronation. "I have fought a good fight, I

[1] Located by tradition near the Ostian Way, and about three miles from Rome.

have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."

The genuineness of the thirteen Epistles which bear the name of Paul is attested not only by their Pauline essence, but also by the concurrent testimony of the early Fathers. Not one of them is destitute of clear external evidences in its favor.[1] As respects the anonymous Epistle to the Hebrews, there was a division of opinion in the early Church, some favoring and some denying its Pauline authorship. The most probable opinion seems to be, that it was written, not by Paul, but by one of his companions or disciples. Who that disciple was cannot be determined; though it is not

[1] Among the Epistles of Paul which have been assailed by modern hypercriticism, the Pastoral occupy the first place. Of these the First Epistle to Timothy has been regarded as most open to attack. Next to the Pastoral Epistles, Colossians and Ephesians have been placed under suspicion. The main ground of objection to Colossians is its supposed reference to Gnostic speculations. Ephesians is challenged, though less decidedly, on the same ground, and is furthermore objected to on the score of its relation to Colossians, — a basis of attack which is by no means formidable, since there are good reasons for coinciding with the verdict of Neander, that the two Epistles must have had the same author. As for the Pastoral Epistles, excluding criticisms which appear frivolous on their face, there are three main objections; namely, peculiar words and phrases, attempts to combat a Gnosticism which had not yet arisen in Paul's time, and an un-Pauline stress upon ecclesiastical organization. The first is answered by a reference to other Epistles of Paul, which exhibit about an equal proportion of peculiar terms, by the extraordinary fertility of this apostolic writer, and by the special demand which was placed upon him. Says Farrar: "St. Paul, it must be remembered, was the main creator of theological language. In the Pastoral Epistles he is dealing with new circumstances, and new circumstances would inevitably necessitate new terms" (*Life*, Excursus ix.). In answer to the second objection, it is to be noticed that there is no reason to conclude that these Epistles refer to a fully developed Gnosticism. Baur was quite too headlong in discovering here a polemic against the system of Marcion. The context indicates a Judaic

strange that conjecture should lean to Apollos, since no one is brought to our attention who might be supposed to have been better qualified to write such a production than was this cultured Alexandrian.

3. JAMES THE JUST. — The identity of this James, who was long at the head of the church in Jerusalem, is not easily determined. One thing is sufficiently established: he stood on a parity with apostles, was a man of an essentially apostolic rank. To be sure, the statement of Paul in Gal. i. 19 cannot be regarded as certainly including James with the apostles. This is

Gnosticism, rather than Marcion's thoroughly anti-Judaic system. And why should it not be concluded that the former type of error was beginning to germinate in the closing years of the apostle? We know that the ingredients of Gnosticism were at hand very largely before Paul began his ministry. We know that his congregations were accessible to other forms of error, that the Galatian church was at one time invaded by a Pharisaic Judaism, and that in the Corinthian church the notion gained a foothold that the resurrection was already past. Why may not some congregations have been touched by a Philonic Judaism, or by the speculative and practical notions of the Essenes? Cerinthus, with his semi-Gnostic scheme, it is well-known, was upon the stage soon after the death of Paul; and it is only natural to suppose that he had forerunners. The third phase in the Pastoral Epistles which is made a ground of objection is very easily explained. Paul was writing to those whose special vocation was administration. What more natural, then, what more nearly inevitable, than that he should touch at considerable length upon points of ecclesiastical organization and discipline. Moreover, a form of church government is disclosed which belonged to a primitive era in the history of the Church, there being an unmistakable identification of bishops and presbyters.

Many positive evidences of Pauline authorship might be cited. There are passages which breathe the spirit of a great personality like that of Paul. There are personal items and minutiæ of circumstance that a forger would never have thought of inventing. In fine, the external evidences for these Epistles are well supported by internal marks of genuineness.

obvious when we compare the original (ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον) with other instances of a like collocation of Greek words, such as we find in Luke iv. 26, 27; Gal. ii. 16; Rev. xxi. 27. On the other hand, parallel passages, such as 1 Cor. i. 14 and 2 Cor. xii. 5, show that the supposition that Paul meant to include James with the apostles is in no wise discordant with Greek usage. But whether Paul directly applies to James the name of apostle, or not, he assigns him the corresponding rank, even associating him with Peter and John as one of the pillars of the Christian community (Gal. ii. 9). Also, in the account of the council at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), no one of the Christian leaders appears clothed with a greater authority and influence than James. That in his Epistle he styles himself a servant rather than an apostle of Jesus Christ finds a parallel in Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Another established fact is, that he was a relative of Jesus. Paul calls him "the brother of the Lord" (Gal. i. 19).

If, now, we turn back to the Gospel narratives and the beginning of Acts, we nowhere find a James who is at once called an apostle and a brother of the Lord. In every list of the apostles (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13), there are but two by the name of James; and one of these is distinguished as the son of Zebedee, and the other as the son of Alphæus. At the same time we find mention of brothers of Jesus, among whom is a James (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3). These facts seem to imply that the James whom Paul calls the brother of the Lord was not one of the original twelve apostles. The son of Zebedee had already been slain at

the time that Paul wrote. The son of Alphæus may still have been living; but what should justify the inference that he was called the brother of the Lord? Is it the high rank, the apostolic standing which seems to pertain to the James to whom Paul assigns that relationship? But James, the brother of the Lord, may have been, like Paul, an apostle by a later calling than that recorded in the Gospels. So it is not strictly necessary to identify him with one of the original Twelve, even when leaving his apostolic rank unquestioned. Moreover, there is a hint that he did not belong to the Twelve, in the statement, which we should not expect to be said of any apostle, namely, that the brothers of Jesus did not believe in him (John vii. 5), as also in representations which appear to draw a distinction between the apostolic group and the brothers of Jesus (John ii. 12; Acts i. 13, 14). Such a mode of expression, it is true, might be possible, if a part of Christ's brothers were outside of the apostolic group, and at one time did not believe in his Messiahship. It is nothing unparalleled in condensed narrative for a part to be put for the whole. But, allowing this, the fact still remains, that the second James in the apostolic list is always called, not the son of Joseph or Mary, not the brother of Jesus, but simply the son of Alphæus. In the absence of some counter-evidence, this fact certainly establishes the presumption that the sacred writers did not think of the son of Alphæus as being among the brothers of Jesus.

Is there any such counter-evidence? We have the fact that Luke in his Gospel mentions only two persons by the name of James, namely, the son of Zebedee and

the son of Alphæus; that in the Acts he narrates the death of the former; that he then goes on to speak of a James who presided over the church at Jerusalem, without saying a word to forbid the natural inference that this was the other James whom he had mentioned. If a real significance be allowed to this fact, there are others which may go with it to help out a plausible theory in behalf of the identity of the son of Alphæus with "the brother of the Lord." By comparing Matt. xxvii. 56, Mark xv. 40, and John xix. 25, we find ground for the conclusion that the mother of our Lord had a sister (whether in the stricter sense of that term or not) called Mary, who was the wife of Clopas and the mother of James and Joses.[1] Now, Clopas may be regarded as representing but another way of rendering the Aramaic word which appears as Alphæus. This would make the son of Alphæus a cousin of Jesus, who might be called a brother in a wide use of terms not entirely without parallel among the Jews; or in case that he was either the issue of a Levirate marriage of Joseph with the widow of Alphæus, or a son of the deceased Alphæus adopted by Joseph, it would make him, in a proper use of terms, a brother of Jesus. It is to be observed, however, that we are here in the region of hypothesis, and the claim of an hypothesis is to be measured by the cogency of the occasion which calls for it.

[1] This conclusion is not beyond challenge. Some eminent critics are of opinion, that in John xix. 25, the sister of Mary and the wife of Clopas do not denote the same person. Still, those who favor their identity will continue to find support for their view in the connection of the words in the sentence. The former class understand that the sister of Mary was Salome, the mother of John, who is known from the accounts of the other evangelists to have been present at the crucifixion.

Now, the occasion which has been mentioned (and we know of no other worth mentioning) is not of extraordinary cogency. Luke, at the time of writing, may very naturally have taken it for granted that the identity of the James who was so prominent in the church at Jerusalem was too well known to need any explanation, and hence omitted to characterize him as other than the second James in the list of apostles. His silence is to be interpreted from his stand-point, and not from ours. So interpreted, it has not great force. There seems, then, to be no adequate counter-evidence to the presumption that the son of Alphæus was not one of the brothers of Jesus, and accordingly not identical with James the Just. On New-Testament data, the identity is at most a possibility, not a probability.

A further question remains. Supposing our James not to have been identical with the son of Alphæus, was he the son of Joseph and Mary? Those who have accepted the dogma of the perpetual virginity of Mary will of course answer with a decided negative. But this dogma has nothing in its support except its comparatively early appearance. We find it with Clement of Alexandria. It may be set aside as a baseless fiction, which had its origin in an extravagant estimate of virginity.[1] Still, after this is done, we are not at once authorized to draw the conclusion that James and the other brothers of Jesus were by birth the sons of Mary. The fact that Jesus is called the firstborn of Mary (Matt. i. 25, Luke ii. 7) is no proof

[1] The apocryphal writings, such as the Protevangelium of James and the Gospel of the *pseudo*-Matthew, are very explicit and emphatic in their assertions of the continued virginity of Mary.

that other children followed, as he might very naturally have been so called to denote that none had preceded Him, rather than to imply that others were born after Him. In fine, there is no decisive evidence that Mary gave birth to other children, nothing strictly forbidding the supposition that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were children of Joseph by a previous marriage (ordinary or Levirate) or by adoption. On the contrary, there is one recorded fact which gives color to the conjecture that Mary had no other sons. Jesus on the cross commended His mother to John, with whom she afterwards made her home (John xix. 26, 27). Why, it may be asked, if Mary had sons of her own, did she not live with them? This consideration has a certain force. However, it is not conclusive; since special reasons, such as the state of material resources among those related to her, may have made it wise that Mary should be intrusted to John.

It seems impossible, therefore, to determine, beyond all peradventure, the exact relation of James the Just within the holy family. The New Testament leaves room for speculation, and beyond the New Testament there is no authentic information. The Fathers who refer to the subject were too manifestly without the means of certain knowledge that we should depend upon them. It may be said, however, that the weight of early patristic opinion is rather on the side of the verdict that James was the son of Joseph by a marriage previous to that contracted with Mary. This has continued to be the current theory in the Greek Church.

It is clear from the New-Testament narratives that James was a man of legal bias. There was much of

Judaic fibre in his make-up. His conservative bent toward Judaism, it is true, may be imputed in part to his position. Thrust out upon the open field of the Gentile world like Paul, he would no doubt have exhibited a somewhat different spirit. At Jerusalem a conservative attitude toward Judaism was the price of existence. No man showing a different front would have been tolerated during the long period covered by the ministry of James. But deference to the ancient ceremonial of his nation probably cost James no special crucifixion. According to the account of Hegesippus, which we may use with proper allowance for exaggeration, he practised voluntary austerities, living the life of a Nazarite, and giving himself to incessant prayer for the people.[1] The same writer represents that he worthily met the fate of a martyr, and sent out his expiring breath in a petition for the forgiveness of his enemies. The death of James is also mentioned by Josephus, who indicates, moreover, that the stoning of the saint was regarded by not a few among the Jews as a piece of unjustifiable rigor.[2] It may be judged from the statement of Josephus that James died about the year 63.

The external evidence for the genuineness of the Epistle which bears the name of James is but slight. While there are indications that it may have been consulted by several of the Fathers of the second century, it is not known to have been quoted as the Epistle of James by any earlier writer than Origen.[3] Eusebius indicates that it was generally accepted in the churches

[1] Euseb., Hist. Eccl., ii. 23. [2] Antiq., xx. 9. 1.

[3] In the passage upon which most dependence can be placed, Origen gives a current opinion, rather than his own verdict as to its authorship.

of his day; but at the same time he plainly intimates his opinion that the paucity of reference to it in the preceding centuries must cause it to be regarded with doubt.[1] On the other hand, the internal evidence for its genuineness is very strong. It has every appearance of having been written by a resident of Jerusalem. It is peculiarly rich in reminiscences of the discourses of Christ, as if the author had often listened to those searching expositions of the moral law which fell from the lips of our Lord. Its teachings are in fullest harmony with all that is reported concerning the character of James and his relation to Judaism. We should expect a man who came to his Christian faith without violent transition, who ascended gradually by the stepping-stones of a spiritualized Judaism, to represent Christianity as it is here represented, — in a word, to portray it as the perfect law, a system of far-reaching duty, something to be realized pre-eminently in deed. In emphasizing this aspect, James, it must be allowed, incurs measurably the appearance of a polemic against Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. His words strictly construed can hardly be brought into harmony with those of Paul construed with like rigor. But the canons of a scientific theology are not to be applied to this simple and practical treatise. Technical divergence does not necessarily imply fundamental contradiction. Indeed, the object of the epistle appears not to have been to oppose a Pauline valuation of faith, but rather to emphasize a truth to which Paul fully subscribed, — the truth that a faith is vain which does not manifest itself in good works. It is a needed protest against an abuse

[1] Hist. Eccl., ii. 23, iii. 25.

of the doctrine of justifying faith. The impatience of Luther with its teaching is explained by the all-absorbing zeal with which he asserted the Pauline shibboleth against Romish legalism. A more sober estimate affirms the high worth, as well as the genuineness, of the Epistle of James.

4. JOHN. — The Apostle John represents the evening of the apostolic age. After all the others have disappeared, so far as historic memorials are concerned, his ministry still pours its radiance above the horizon. From the death of Paul, till near the close of the century, he was the chief, if not the only, representative of the apostolic dignity.

In John we meet a nature less versatile and many-sided than that of Paul. He had not the dialectic talent of the latter. It may be doubted, also, whether he possessed an equal capacity for practical activity and administration. He was more exclusively the true mystic. He may fitly be called the apostle of contemplation and intuition. His method of grasping truth bears more analogy to the gaze of the seer, than to logical procedure by induction and deduction. Christian symbolism was true to a cardinal feature of his inner life and thought, when it represented him as rising on eagle's wings towards the heights of heaven. His attention was turned toward the central and fundamental, toward that which lies deepest in the nature of God, or nearest to the core of human duty and human weal. It was not his ambition to cover as wide an extent of horizon as possible, or to elucidate the greatest number of aspects in sacred themes. His intense soul, enamored

of the things of supreme moment, gave concentration to his discourse. We recognize in his writings one who wished to keep near to the heart of Christian truth.

Among the evangelists, John appears in particular as the expositor of the person of Christ. His contemplation did not stop with outward and official aspects. Looking beyond the earthly appearance, he saw in the Son of man the Son of God, who dwelt with the Father before the world was, in true identity of essence and of glory. "At the very beginning of his discourse," says Augustine, "he soared not only above the earth, and above the whole compass of air and sky, but even above the whole army of angels and the whole order of invisible powers, and reached to Him by whom all things were made. He has spoken concerning the divinity of the Lord as none other has spoken. What he drank in he gave forth. For it is not without reason that it is recorded of him in this very Gospel, that at supper he reclined on the Lord's bosom."[1] But he did not neglect the human aspect of his Lord. On the contrary, he enunciated His humanity in vigorous, dogmatic affirmation. More than this, he richly illustrated the theme. In scenes drawn with inimitable delicacy and aptness of delineation, he pictures Christ in His human converse, sympathies, and friendships.

Among the apostles, John is distinguished by his conception of the Christian as a possessor of eternal life. While Peter inculcates the active faith which conquers difficulties and leads to a sanctified life, while Paul lays much stress upon the justifying faith which procures reconciliation with God, John proclaims faith

[1] Tract. in Joan., xxxvi.

in particular as the medium of eternal life. An eternal life begun in the present, and exemplifying itself in a fellowship of love, is the conception everywhere underlying John's portrait of Christian privilege and duty. These different stand-points, the Petrine, the Pauline, and the Johannine, distinguished as respects relative emphasis upon different truths, give the appearance of successive doctrinal developments within the apostolic age. Some have imagined that these developments have been destined to a repetition upon a wider scale. The Petrine stand-point, it is claimed, affiliates with the Roman-Catholic theology, the Pauline with the Protestant, while the Johannine represents the reconciliation and higher union of the two. As the Church has passed through a Petrine and a Pauline stage, it has arrived now at the border of a Johannine era. This view, pushed to the extreme, is artificial and fanciful. There is no such broad contrast between Petrinism and Paulinism as exists between Romanism and Protestantism. No definite line of demarkation can be drawn between the teaching of Paul and of John. The two types are not exclusive of each other. They were not so in the mind of Paul himself. His thought often ran into the domain of John, as in that sublimest hymn to the praise of love in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and also in his many references to an interior life-union with Christ. The Church in its most advanced stage will not put aside Peter or Paul in favor of John, but acknowledge the truth taught by each. Nevertheless, a degree of truth pertains to the theory. We have actually entered upon an age which lays more stress upon the Johannine theology than any age which has preceded.

In the closing period of his life, John fixed his headquarters at Ephesus, and gave his special attention to the churches of Asia Minor. Great need existed for a careful administration in that field. The grievous wolves of which Paul had prophesied (Acts xx. 29) had already appeared. The growing tendencies to unbridled thought broke out into open, aggressive heresy. Cerinthus began to publish his compound of Ebionism and Gnosticism. Against these errors John set himself with the full strength of his ardent nature, which could hate the evil as deeply as it loved the good, and with his peculiar type of theology, which undoubtedly was a very suitable antidote to the Gnostic speculations. By his emphasis upon the reality of Christ's incarnation, and the importance of His earthly history, he raised a barrier against the docetism of the Gnostics; at the same time, by his broad and soaring conceptions, by his comprehensive view of mediation, according to which the whole universe finds in the Logos the perfect bond of connection with the Father, he gave valid satisfaction to an ambition which underlay Gnosticism; he answered legitimately the desire to interpret redemption as a factor in the great scheme of the universe.

The residence of the Apostle John at Ephesus, and his close connection with the churches of Asia Minor, are for the historian well-established facts. The motive for disputing these facts is any thing but historical. Lützelberger, in 1840, revealed the true *animus* of all denial of the Ephesian residence, when he declared that, if John lived to advanced age in Ephesus, it is inconceivable that a writing purporting to have come from

his hand could have been palmed off upon the Church in that region within the first half of the second century. The presupposition that John did not write the Fourth Gospel was at the foundation of his attempt to close Ephesus against the apostle. The more recent attempt of Keim and others has been dictated by the same interest. Unanimity, however, has by no means been reached in the camp of the doubters. On the contrary, so far as the authority of names is concerned, the verdict of those just mentioned has been fully cancelled by the opposing verdict of critics equally hostile to the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But this point needs not to be specially emphasized. By abundant testimonies of the early Church, it is established that John spent his later years at Ephesus. (1) It is evident that the Apocalypse came from a resident of proconsular Asia. The Church, before the strong opposition to Chiliasm had become developed in the Alexandrian school, near the middle of the third century, was generally agreed in referring the Apocalypse to the Apostle John. Such was the verdict of Justin Martyr about the year 150.[1] Justin's statement is, therefore, evidence that in his time the residence of John in proconsular Asia, or the region of Ephesus, was an accepted fact. (2) Irenæus, a native of Asia Minor, or at least a resident there from youth to manhood, and born about the year 130, a man who was acquainted with Polycarp, the disciple of John, gives this explicit testimony: "Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned upon his breast, did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at

[1] Dial. cum Tryph., lxxxi.

Ephesus in Asia."[1] (3) Contemporaries of Irenæus, having the best opportunities for information, render their independent testimony to the same effect. Thus Polycrates, whose own statement shows that he was born about the year 125 or 130, and who was Bishop of Ephesus in the last part of the second century, numbers the Apostle John among the great lights which had gone out in (proconsular) Asia, and adds, "He is buried in Ephesus."[2] Apollonius, who was also a resident of Asia Minor about the same time, takes it for granted that the Apostle John lived at Ephesus.[3] Clement of Alexandria speaks of the return of John from Patmos to Ephesus.[4] (4) If it had not been a fact universally accepted, that John labored among the churches of Asia Minor, the Church at Rome probably would have denied that fact during the Easter controversy in the latter part of the second century. But we have no intimation of such a denial.[5] (5) An early version, the Peshito-Syriac, appends to John's Gospel this sentence: "The end of the holy Gospel, the preaching of John the Evangelist which he published in Greek at Ephesus."[6] Now, such a mass of historical evidence as this is not easily to be offset. Certainly, the mere silence of Ignatius in a brief epistle, or the silence of one or two other writers in such fragments of their works as have come down to us, is utterly powerless to overthrow the grounds of the verdict that the Apostle John spent his later years in Ephesus.

[1] Cont. Hær., iii. 1. 1. Compare iii. 3. 4; v. 30. 1; also the Epistles to Florinus and Victor as reported by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., v. 20, 24.

[2] Euseb., v. 24. [3] Ibid., v. 18. [4] Quis Dives Salvetur, xlii.

[5] See Luthardt, Der Johanneische Ursprung des Vierten Evangeliums.

[6] Harman, Introduction.

For hardly any book of the New Testament is the external evidence more ample than for the Gospel of John. A very large proportion of the Fathers of the second century, by quotation or by direct mention, have testified to its genuineness. Gnostic sects have left many indications that they acknowledged its apostolic origin. An obscure party, the Alogi, belonging to the latter part of the second century, and having probably neither the dimensions nor the consistency of a sect, were the only opponents of this Gospel which the ancient Church was able to specify.[1] And their opposition, so far as known, was not based upon historical grounds, but upon dislike of the Logos teaching; accordingly, it amounts to nothing as a counter-evidence. Modern opponents of the Fourth Gospel have frequently proved themselves to be Alogi, if not in the sense which an uncharitable use might give to that term. A dogmatic presupposition has given shape to their conclusions. Strauss is a clear example of this. In the fourth edition of his Leben Jesu, he re-affirmed the doubts about the genuineness of John's Gospel, which he acknowledged in his third edition had been somewhat shaken by able criticisms upon his work, *because without them one could not escape believing the miracles of Christ.* Historically, the evidence for the Fourth Gospel is all that the known conditions would authorize one to expect. Adverse criticism itself has been compelled to pay tribute to the force of this evidence. Especially noteworthy is the retreat from the supposition of Baur, that this Gospel was not writen till A.D. 160 or 170, and the substitution, by more recent exponents of radi-

[1] Epiphanius, Hær., li., liv.

cal criticism, of dates as early as A.D. 140, 130, and in some cases even 115 or 110.[1]

In the line of internal evidences, also, there are ample means for defending the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. In whatever measure it transcends Judaism, it still bears indelible traces of Jewish antecedents. Its author had evidently been in the inner courts of Judaism. He was minutely conversant with its ideas and its ceremonial system. Not only was he a Jew, but he was a resident of Palestine, as is indicated by his thorough knowledge of the topography of the country. He was an eye-witness of the Gospel scenes; at least, many touches in his descriptions receive a satisfactory explanation only on this supposition. He was in confident possession of all the needful data for his narrative, and wrote as one having the authority of distinct personal reminiscence, so that he did not think it necessary to maintain an appearance of strict accord with other records of the Gospel history. Thus, many considerations point to John as the author of this unique sketch of the life of Christ. There is, indeed, an unmistakable contrast between the Fourth Gospel and the other three; but the contrast argues for, rather than against, the Johannine authorship. The effect of an author's personality upon his presentation of a given subject-matter is apt to be in the ratio of the strength of his personality. Suppose a man of Paul's mental constitution, after years of intimate personal fellowship with Christ, and added years of labor in extending His kingdom, had undertaken to write the life of his Master:

[1] For a brief and excellent compendium of the external evidences, see Ezra Abbot, Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

does any one imagine that a larger impress of the author's personality would not have been left upon his narrative than appears upon the synoptic Gospels? that a gospel according to Paul would not have had a distinctly Pauline tinge? Why, then, should it not be expected that John, the bosom friend of his Lord, would give to his Gospel the coloring of his own deep and strong personality? In truth, the theory of Johannine authorship demands a gospel clearly differenced from the others by a Johannine cast. This prominence of the personal element, it must be allowed, brings in the liability of a somewhat detrimental result. It is possible that the more commonplace talents of the synoptists were suited to give certain events in a purer objectivity than that which such a writer as John would be likely to maintain in presenting the same. But, on the other hand, the deeper personality of John qualified him for a better understanding of the person and speech of Him who was at once the Son of man and the Son of God. So we are impelled to the conclusion that the Fourth Gospel helps us to a far more adequate and truthful conception of Christ and His teaching, than could be obtained in its absence. Of all the books in the sacred canon, there is no one which the Christian heart would be more loath to relinquish than this book of the beloved disciple, this incomparable mirror of the incarnate Wisdom and Love.

The First Epistle of John was received by the early Church with the same unanimity as his Gospel. The two stand obviously in the relation of mutual confirmation. The Second and Third Epistles, owing to their brevity and the private nature of their contents, were

not frequently cited; but there is little ground for questioning their Johannine authorship. Their style plainly suggests that they came from the same hand which wrote the First Epistle.

Up to the middle of the third century, the Church was well-nigh unanimous in referring the Apocalypse to the Apostle John. Only one catholic writer of an earlier date, Caius of Rome, used language which may be construed into an adverse reference to this book.[1] After the middle of the third century, a portion of the Church was disposed, for a time, to doubt the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse. The source of the doubt seems to have been a dogmatic bias. There was occasion to oppose an intemperate millenarianism. This found an ostensible ground in the symbolic language of the Apocalypse. So hostility to the dogma led to prejudice against the book. The first to begin a critical attack, of which we have any record, was Dionysius of Alexandria. He called attention to the difference between the style of the Apocalypse and that of the Fourth Gospel, and leaned to the conjecture that the former was written by an Ephesian presbyter by the name of John.[2] This Ephesian presbyter has also figured not a little in the representations of later critics. But there is no real warrant for the existence of such a person, except an ambiguous passage from Papias.[3] And,

[1] Euseb., Hist. Eccl., iii. 28. [2] Euseb., vii. 24, 25.

[3] The mere conjecture of Dionysius is, of course, no evidence as to fact. The reference to two tombs at Ephesus is of little more weight. They may denote that there were at one time rival claims as to the place of the apostle's sepulture; indeed, Jerome informs us (De Viris Illustr., ix.) that some in his day thought that both the tombs inscribed to John were memorials of the evangelist. We are thus left with next

even if he did exist, the notion that he wrote the Apocalypse is a fancy as void almost of probability as of historic basis. Surely the tone of authority and admonition which pervades the messages to the Asiatic churches is not well suited to the supposition that the author was an otherwise unknown presbyter. We are directed, rather, to an eminent leader, — a man of apostolic rank. There are, it is true, very noticeable differences between the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. The former is more Hebraic in style and spirit, and less pure in its Greek. But these differences admit of a satisfactory explanation. An apocalyptic writing naturally rested, to a conspicuous degree, upon an Old-Testament basis. A mind educated in Jewish lore could hardly fail, when essaying this peculiar species of composition, to draw largely from the imagery and phraseology of an Ezekiel, a Daniel, and a Zechariah. It is probable, also, that the Apocalypse was written considerably earlier than the Gospel. The testimony

to nothing but the words of Papias. These are as follows: "If at any time any one came who had been acquainted with the elders, I used to inquire about the discourses of the elders, — what Andrew or what Peter said (εἶπεν), or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or any one of the disciples of the Lord; and what Aristion and John the Elder, the disciples of the Lord, say (λέγουσι). For I thought that the information derived from books would not be so profitable to me as that derived from a living and abiding utterance" (EUSEB., *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39). On the sense of these words, F. W. Farrar gives these apt comments: "Now, certainly, if Papias had been a careful modern writer, we should have inferred from this passage that the John mentioned in the first clause was a different person from the John mentioned in the second. In the first, he says that it had been his habit to inquire from any who had known 'the elders' — of whom he especially mentions seven apostles — what these 'elders' *said*; and also what Aristion and John the Elder, the disciples of the Lord, *say*. But, although this

of Irenæus is, indeed, against this assumption, since he states that John received his revelation near the end of Domitian's reign.[1] So far as external evidence is concerned, there is nothing which fully offsets the declaration of Irenæus. Yet the external evidence is not wholly on his side. To say nothing of Epiphanius, who carries back the island exile of John to the reign of Claudius,[2] a comparison of Tertullian and Jerome (the one of whom indicates that John was banished directly after being cast into boiling oil at Rome,[3] and the other, according to a not improbable reading, that the latter event took place in the time of Nero[4]) gives color to the supposition that the early tradition did not wholly coincide with the view of Irenæus. We have a suggestion that the emperor, whom Clement of Alexandria and Origen, in their reference to the subject, call simply the "tyrant," was Nero rather than Domitian. If we turn to internal evidence, this suggestion becomes, according to the verdict of a large proportion of recent critics, well-nigh a certainty. Various items, such as

would be the *natural* inference, it is by no means the *certain* inference. The antithesis may be between the past and present tense ('said' and 'say'), and not between two sources of original information. There is nothing to forbid the explanation, that, when Papias met any one who had known the immediate apostles and disciples of the Lord, — St. John among them, — he made notes of what (according to his informant) these elders said; but, in writing this clause, he remembers, that, at the time when he was making his notes, two of the immediate disciples of the Lord were not dead, but living; namely, Aristion, to whom, since he was not an apostle, he does not give the direct title of 'elder,' and John, whom he identifies with those whom he has mentioned in the first clause by calling him, as he called them, the 'elder.'" (*Early Days of Christianity*, Excursus xiv.)

[1] Cont. Hær., v. 30. 3.
[2] Hær., li. 12.
[3] De Præscrip., xxxvi.
[4] Cont. Jovin., i. 26.

the reference to the Jewish temple (xi. 1, 2), and the statements respecting the seven kings (xvii. 10), point to a time shortly prior to the year 70, when the Jewish capital was laid waste, and its sanctuary destroyed. It is concluded, therefore, that Irenæus, from some cause, misconceived the time of John's exile, and that the Apocalypse was written between the Neronian persecution and the fall of Jerusalem. Surely no era was more fitted to stir to an impassioned and prophetic outburst than this. Behind was the scene of Christian brethren cruelly tortured and slain; before was the gathering cloud which threatened destruction to the holy city. In the former, heathen might wore an aspect of unmixed horror; in the latter, though it appeared as an instrument of deserved vengeance, it was not without a shuddering that its direful work upon the cherished shrine of the favored nation could be witnessed. It is no marvel, then, that a peculiar fervor burns through the Apocalypse; it is no marvel, too, that it has somewhat more of a Jewish tinge than the Gospel. This feature is explained by the date and circumstances under which it was written, as well as by the models from which it took its coloring. If we suppose the Gospel to have been written near the close of John's life, after a long residence in a Greek city, in the calm spirit congenial to advanced years, we have at once an explanation of its purer Greek and its milder tone. Thus the main objections to a common authorship of the two works are cancelled, and we are justified in allowing full force to the real kinship between them. Both assign a superlative worth to the person of Christ, and make Him the Alpha and the Omega in the sphere

of Christian thought; both render a profound tribute to the significance of His sacrifice, presenting Him as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. Indeed, so marked is the relation between the two writings that sceptical criticism itself has been impelled to the concession that the Gospel, so to speak, renews the Apocalypse in a spiritualized and transfigured form.[1]

The obscurity which rests upon the other apostles is not to be taken as a measure of their labors or usefulness. Though their deeds are without any certain memorial in the volume of human history, we may well believe that they make a luminous record in a larger and more impartial volume. They probably declared the gospel message in Egypt, Arabia, Syria, and the adjacent countries. Tradition has its account of the labors and the fate of each; but in some cases it lacks consistency, and in general affords but little ground of assurance. We only know that light arose upon broad regions; the illuminating orbs and their movements are hidden from our view.

IV.—CHARISMS OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

A new era in the kingdom of God is wont to be ushered in with new manifestations of divine agency. To the theophanies of the patriarchal age succeeded the miracles of the Mosaic age. At the bloom period of the Jewish monarchy, the spirit of wisdom expressed itself in psalm and proverb; at the decline of the mon-

[1] Baur, Kirchengeschichte, vol. i., p. 147.

archy, in the serious and sublime utterances of Messianic prophecy. Naturally, therefore, Christianity came with peculiar tokens of an extraordinary divine working.

Paul's discourse upon the subject (1 Cor. xii., xiii.) indicates, that, from the apostolic stand-point, for every department of Christian activity there were corresponding charisms or gifts of the Spirit. Some of these pertained especially to worship, others to the office of teaching, others to that of administration. Some appear more as a simple strengthening and sanctifying of a natural capacity, others as an unmistakable and striking exhibition of divine power.

Doubtless the charism most unique and characteristic of the age was the gift of tongues. This may be defined with sufficient assurance as utterance in a condition of religious ecstasy. The recipient of the gift, moved by an extraordinary afflatus, rapt up into a state of partial unconsciousness as to outward surroundings, in the transport of devotion and joy which filled him, found vent to his emotions in unusual forms of expression, — possibly in snatches of a language which he could not speak in an ordinary condition, but whose latent impression upon his mind could be raised to the sphere of actual mental operation under peculiar excitation; possibly at times in sounds whose sense was indicated on somewhat the same principle as enables music to be an image of thought and feeling, the key being not so much in any distinct vocabulary as in tones and modulations. The principal use of the charism seems to have been that of an attestation in behalf of Christianity or of a Christian believer. Stopping with the account of Pentecost, we might indeed come to a

different conclusion, and regard the gift of tongues as a great missionary instrument, designed especially to facilitate the proclamation of the gospel to nations of unknown language. But the after history fails to confirm this view. In all the subsequent instances in which the gift is mentioned, it appears not as a missionary instrument or means of imparting instruction, but as a seal of the grace already given, or as an incident of worship. Thus Cornelius and his house spoke with tongues *after* they had been taught by Peter the way of salvation (Acts x.). Thus the subjects of John's baptism whom Paul found at Ephesus spoke with tongues *after* the apostle had baptized them, and laid his hands upon them (Acts xix.). Thus Paul writes to the Corinthians: "He that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the Church. If any man speak in a tongue, let one interpret. But, if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church" (1 Cor. xiv.). Plainly, such instances and such language forbid the assumption that the gift of tongues was specifically a means of communication. Even on the Day of Pentecost it was more a divine token and means of arresting attention than it was a means of instruction. The great missionary speech of that occasion was the address of Peter after the speaking with tongues had ceased.

The period covered by the more extraordinary gifts cannot be definitely determined. The impression made by the history is, that already at the close of the apostolic age well-authenticated cases of their appearance were rare. Some of the ante-Nicene writers, notably

Irenæus,[1] speak of their continued occurrence. Origen believed that they had not wholly vanished; but, at the same time, he used language implying a conviction that his own age was less fruitful in them than the apostolic era.[2] In general there is but little record of specific instances of miraculous working in the second and third centuries. Not till the time of spiritual declension and monastic aberrations did the Church begin, by its heaped-up narratives, to bring out its parody of the New-Testament miracles. No one, indeed, is authorized to mark off any particular period as the age of miracles, or even to exclude the present age. Still, it is an unfounded expectation, an abnormal craving, which would look for supernatural manifestations in the apostolic mode and measure. The Montanist and Irvingite theories run counter to the plan of the divine administration. They ignore the true goal of Christianity, which is not to emphasize a dualism between the natural and the supernatural, but so to pervade and to sanctify the whole nature of man, that in all his activities God shall work in him both to will and to do of His good pleasure.

It is noteworthy that the same oracles which record the bestowment of these marvellous gifts warn against an overvaluation of them. In words which supremely exalt the ethical stand-point of Christianity, and forbid

[1] Cont Hær., ii 31, 32.

[2] Cont. Celsum, i. 2, 46. In the following sentence Origen enumerates the kinds of miracles which he supposed to be still performed by Christians: "They expel evil spirits, and perform many cures, and foresee certain events according to the will of the Logos." Justin Martyr notices especially the first of these (Dial. cum Tryph., xxx). See also Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, ii., iv.; Apol., xxiii.; Cons. Apost., viii. 1, 2.

that the moral should in any wise be subordinated to the marvellous, Paul teaches that love is the highest gift, without which power even to remove mountains is of no significance, and language rivalling the speech of angels an empty sound.

V.—APOSTOLIC CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

The constitution of the Church under the apostles exhibits both a hierarchical and a democratic principle. As the apostles were the first appointed officers of the Church, so also they were its highest authority, and the starting-point from which all subordinate authority was derived. This was the hierarchical principle. But in the manner in which the apostles used their authority, as also in the prevalent conception of the Christian priesthood, a democratic principle came into operation. The apostles administered the Church much in the spirit of Peter's instruction to the elders, "not as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock" (1 Pet. v. 3). So far as was practicable, they acted in co-operation with the Christian congregation. Hence, we find the congregation apparently sharing in such a matter as the election of a member to the apostolic college in place of Judas; and as respects the first deacons, the apostles did not so much as claim the prerogative of nomination, but left the selection to the free choice of the assembly, and simply ordained the candidates presented. A similar respect was shown to the will of the congregation in the appointment of presbyters. Their ordination was ordinarily the function of an apostle or the delegate of an apostle; though it

would appear that presbyters themselves were competent to take part in, if not indeed to execute, the ordination ceremony[1] (1 Tim. iv. 14). Perhaps, also, in case of less competent and experienced churches, the apostles may have nominated presbyters; but it was no doubt the general custom to employ the vote of the congregation, and to give it practically a determining power. Clement of Rome testifies that the ministry were appointed "with the consent of the whole church."[2] The Coptic constitution of the Church of Alexandria witnesses to the existence of the right of election at the middle of the second century, a fact strongly indicative of the existence of the right from the beginning.[3] Even in a matter of discipline, we find Paul addressing, not a select corps of officers, but the whole Corinthian Church. In short, the apostles treated their fellow-Christians as citizens, rather than as mere subjects. All were regarded as belonging to a royal priesthood (1 Pet. ii. 9). Liberty to teach and to participate in the worship was limited only by the talents of individual members, and by the demands of good order (1 Cor. xiv. 23–26).

As the more important officers of the Church, the following classes may be enumerated: (1) apostles, (2) prophets, (3) evangelists, (4) presbyters, or bishops, (5) deacons. The first three classes were general officers, the last two local. The pastors and teachers men-

[1] In the Alexandrian Church, even down to the beginning of the fourth century, it was an established custom that the body of presbyters should ordain the bishop. See Lightfoot on the Epistle to the Philippians, Dissertation I.

[2] Epist. ad. Corinth., xliv.

[3] Pressensé, Apostolic Era, Book II., chap. v.

tioned by Paul (Eph. iv. 11) may be regarded as embraced in the fourth class. The form of the original suggests that these two words were meant to denote the same group of officers.[1] The presbyters, to be sure, may have occupied at the outset more distinctively the position of pastors, or administrators, than that of teachers; but certainly teaching came very soon to be regarded as an important part of their office. This is sufficiently indicated by the qualifications which Paul emphasizes in his later Epistles (1 Tim. iii. 2; Titus i. 9).

The New Testament seems to indicate that for the apostolic office two qualifications were counted essential: first, that the incumbent should have been a witness of the facts of the gospel history, especially the resurrection; and, secondly, that he should have received a positive call from Christ to the office (Acts i. 21–22; 1 Cor. xv. 8; Gal. i. 1). In case of the original eleven, both of these conditions were evidently fulfilled. They were also fulfilled in the case of Paul. In virtue of a special manifestation of the ascended Christ, he was enabled to mention himself among the witnesses of the resurrection. His call also was so direct and positive that he could write: "Paul an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ." Concerning Matthias, we have a less direct and formal assurance. He was a witness of Christ's resurrection, but as to his call we have only the account of his election by the Christian assembly. As this election took place before the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, some have entertained the suspicion that Matthias was an apostle by

[1] So Lightfoot and others.

the will of man rather than by the will of Christ. Certainly if the apostolate was limited to the number twelve, this is the explanation that must be accepted. But there is no need of affirming such a limitation. That Christ should speak of only twelve thrones (Matt. xix. 28), just corresponded to the number of apostles who were then with him. That the Revelator should represent that just twelve names were engraved on the foundations of the wall of the New Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 14), is sufficiently explained by the Jewish preference for round numbers, and the association of Jewish thought with the tribal number twelve. How little such phraseology compels us to limit the number of the apostles to twelve, is shown by the case of the tribes themselves. These were continually spoken of as the twelve tribes, whereas thirteen tribes settled in Palestine. Still the apostolate, if not strictly limited to the number twelve, is to be regarded as a limited office. Its first incumbents were few; and they had, properly speaking, no successors. They were designed for a special work of foundation which needs not to be repeated. The qualifications which the New Testament associates with their office bar out the idea of its transmission. Official substitutes to a certain extent, or as respects some parts of their functions, they may have had, but not successors proper.

The office of the prophets was connected with teaching, rather than with administration. As inspired preachers of the truth, they exercised their gifts more or less at large in the Church. Paul's companion, Silas, together with Agabus and Judas, are examples. The evangelists had similar functions; and some, indeed, belonged to

both classes. They served as itinerant missionaries and vicegerents of the apostles, and labored under their direction in varied fields. Timothy, Titus, Luke, and John Mark belonged to this class.

The presbyters, or elders, were the highest local authority in a church. With them rested the chief responsibility, both for the government of the Christian society and for the provision of suitable instruction. The common mention of them in the plural shows that a number were elected to the office in each church. They formed a presiding council analogous to the board of elders in the Jewish synagogue. It was from the synagogue that the name presbyter, or elder, was borrowed. The episcopal title, on the other hand, the name overseer, or bishop, was of Gentile origin, having been used among the Greeks to indicate an office involving a species of oversight. Originally both names related entirely to the same office. The New Testament recognizes no distinction between them. The words presbyter and bishop are used interchangeably. In the twentieth chapter of Acts, Paul calls the same body, in one instance presbyters, in another bishops. In his Epistle to Titus he directs him to ordain presbyters; but, when he goes on to mention the qualifications of these officials, he uses the word bishop. In the opening of his Epistle to the Philippians, the apostle salutes the bishops and deacons, making no mention of the presbyters, whom he evidently would have mentioned had he not considered them identical with the bishops. Likewise, in the First Epistle to Timothy, he passes directly from bishops to deacons (chap. iii.). Peter also addresses the presbyters in a way that implies that they were the highest local

authority in the several churches, and acknowledged no officer between them and the apostles (1 Pet. v. 1–2). It is possible, indeed, that, before the death of the Apostle John, in many congregations, one of the presbyters, as president of the board of presbyters, became distinguished from the general body, and ranked as *primus inter pares*. Such a development would have been entirely natural, and would have served as a suitable means of transition to those local bishops who appear after the apostolic age. But the New Testament does not inform us of the growth even of this distinction. It nowhere raises one presbyter above the rest, and clothes him with a special dignity as bishop. The angels of the Asiatic churches whom the Revelator addressed are no exception. Language so highly figurative affords no definite information on church constitution. The angel might be regarded as an ideal representative of the church addressed, or as a personification of its government, however that was constituted. A bishop in the later sense nowhere appears within the New-Testament horizon. Evangelists, like Timothy and Titus, were remote from that type of officer. They were simply trusted friends and ministers extraordinary of the apostle, no more like the bishops of the second century than a special ambassador is like a permanent governor of a specified district. The position of James in the church at Jerusalem was nearer that of a bishop. But similarity is not identity. James held a commanding place by the twofold title of his personal character and his essentially apostolic dignity.

Traces of the original identity of presbyters and bishops appear in the phraseology of post-apostolic

writers, as will be shown in another connection. Eminent expositors, like Jerome and Theodoret, acknowledged such identity in the most explicit terms.[1] In the present, the same is very largely the verdict of enlightened scholarship, at least on the part of those accepting the genuineness of the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles. Bishop Lightfoot speaks for a large class when he says of the terms bishop and presbyter, "In the apostolic writings the two are only different designations of one and the same office." The same author concludes that the elevation of the office of bishop above that of presbyter was a thing of gradual accomplishment, and was effected, in its more essential features, between A.D. 70 and 120. "It is clear," he says, "that at the close of the apostolic age, the two lower orders of the threefold ministry were firmly and widely established; but traces of the third and highest order, the episcopal, properly so called, are few and indistinct. For the opinion hazarded by Theodoret, and adopted by many later writers, that the same officers in the Church who were first called apostles came afterwards to be designated bishops, is baseless."[2]

No specific account is given of the origin of the presbyterate. When first mentioned (Acts xi. 30), it appears as an already existing institution. Some have supposed that it was contained in the diaconate, or what is commonly called the diaconate; in other words, that the enlarging demands of the Church caused that a subdivision should be made of the duties, which were

[1] Epist., lxix., Ad Oceanum; cxlvi., Ad Evangelium (Migne's Patrologia); Ad Phil., i. 1.

[2] Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, Dissertation I.

primarily devolved upon the seven who were set apart for special service, as represented in the sixth chapter of Acts.[1] The greater probability, however, lies with the theory which assigns to the presbyterate a separate sphere, even at its initiation. At the time that the deacons were appointed, the apostles, still residing in Jerusalem, were in condition themselves to perform the functions of a board of presbyters. But as they were dispersed by persecution, or went forth on their missionary tours, a substitute for their personal supervision was naturally sought in a local board of officers. And, as the first Christian churches were closely allied with the synagogue, the latter readily supplied the name, and to a large extent the pattern, of the new board of administrators.

The deacons were concerned with the collection and distribution of funds, and in general with the temporal affairs of the Church. Preaching was not an essential part of their office; and, when it was engaged in by them, it followed from a special charism, rather than from their official standing. Still, the pastoral elements in their work tended to make them spiritual guides of the people, and to encourage the use of their preaching talents. As is narrated in the sixth chapter of Acts, the order arose out of a special exigency. Some, indeed, are inclined to deny that we have here an account of the original institution of the order, and imagine that a hint of an earlier origin is found in the young men who carried out the bodies of Ananias and Sapphira. To be sure, the seven are not called deacons (διάκονοι),

[1] Lechler, Apostolische und Nachapostolische Zeitalter, pp. 305–308; Döllinger, First Age of the Church, Book III., chap. i.

but their service (which is called διακονία) was such as has always been associated with the office of deacon. Moreover, tradition favors the supposition that the election of the seven was the beginning of the order. Irenæus was fully persuaded that this was the proper account of the matter.[1] Such, too, was plainly the belief of the Church at Rome near the middle of the third century, when it adhered to the number seven for its deacons, though its presbyters at the same time were no less than forty-six.[2] Even at a considerably later date, as appears from the testimony of Sozomen,[3] the Roman Church felt bound to follow the primitive model, and allowed but seven on its board of deacons. The council of Neo-Cæsarea, about 315, took a like view of the subject, assuming that the seven appointed under the apostles were veritable deacons, and that their number was not to be transcended in any congregation.

A vocation similar to that of the deacons was fulfilled by an order of women. Paul applies the name of deacon to Phebe (Rom. xvi. 1), and mentions in several instances women who had labored in the Lord (Rom. xvi. 12; Phil. iv. 3). From the instructions given in the First Epistle to Timothy (v. 9, 10), some have inferred that the apostle regarded aged widows as among the most suitable candidates for the position of deaconess. But the reference here may be simply to the standing of widows entitled to receive support, and rendering certain services in return. That others than widows were early received into the office of deaconess,

[1] Cont. Hær., i. 26. 3; iii. 12. 10; iv. 15. 1. [2] Euseb., vi. 43.
[3] Hist. Eccl., vii. 19.

is sufficiently certain. Those holding this office supplemented the work of the deacons, carrying to the women of the congregations ministrations which men could not appropriately render, or even render at all, under the social conditions largely prevalent in Greek and Oriental communities.

CHAPTER II.

STRUGGLE OF CHRISTIANITY WITH HEATHENISM.

I.—SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE HEATHEN EMPIRE.

WITH the freshness and vigor of a divine youth Christianity made its way in the world. Weak in all outward respects, it had that matchless strength which comes from newness of life. Hence, we find it growing in spite of every obstacle, establishing its new creation on the decaying empire of heathenism. The generation succeeding the apostles had hardly passed away before Christian apologists could appeal to the world-wide extension of Christianity as a token of its divine origin. "There is not one single race of men," said Justin Martyr, about the middle of the second century, "whether barbarians or Greeks, or whatever they may be called, nomads, or vagrants, or herdsmen living in tents, among whom prayers and giving of thanks are not offered through the name of the crucified Jesus."[1] "We are but of yesterday," exclaimed Tertullian, "and we have filled every place among you, cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market-places, the very camp, tribes, companies, palace, senate, forum; we have left nothing to you but the temples of your gods."[2]

[1] Dial. cum Tryph., cxvii. [2] Apol., xxxvii.

The religion of Christ, he states in another place, has invaded "the varied races of the Gætulians, and manifold confines of the Moors, all the limits of the Spains, and the diverse nations of the Gauls, and the haunts of the Britons, and of the Sarmatians and Dacians and Germans and Scythians, and of many remote nations, and of provinces and islands, many to us unknown, and which we can scarce enumerate."[1] These rhetorical passages contain, indeed, an element of hyperbole; still, they supply a clear indication of the remarkable rapidity and energy of Christian evangelism in the first centuries. Another evidence in the same direction is found in the action of the Roman Government. That the most prudent and enlightened emperors of the second century deemed it necessary to repress Christianity in order to guard the integrity of the Empire, shows that the new religion was already looked upon as a formidable power.

The large cities were the first to receive the gospel. This accorded with the obvious demands of missionary enterprise. The Greek language, the language of the first missionaries to the Gentiles, was much more prevalent in the large cities than in the country districts, at least in the West. These cities, moreover, were the centres of communication in the different provinces, and were naturally fixed upon as missionary headquarters, from which Christian laborers were to be sent forth in every direction. The gospel was, no doubt, preached very soon to the rural population; but its progress was less rapid among this class, both because they were less accessible and received less attention,

[1] Adv. Judæos, vii. Compare Ad Nationes, i. 1.

and because they were more stubbornly attached to the old heathenism. Among the evidences of their relative backwardness to receive Christianity is the name of "pagans," which became ultimately a current designation of the heathen party.

During the first three centuries the proper seat of Christianity in Asia was Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor. In other countries of the continent, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Parthia, Media, Persia, and Bactria, it obtained only a sporadic existence. Its introduction into India within this period, though possible, is more matter of tradition than of history. The indefinite geographical sense in which the ancients used the name India adds much to the uncertainty of the subject. Little or no reliance can be placed upon the report that the Apostles Thomas and Bartholomew labored in India proper, and doubt may also be entertained whether Pantænus reached that country in the eastward tour which he made near the end of the second century.[1]

The Church in Egypt was founded in the apostolic age; Alexandria, with its inquiring and cultured population, naturally serving as the starting-point and headquarters. Tradition is unanimous in naming the evangelist Mark the pioneer in this region. Of the introduction of Christianity into North, or proconsular, Africa, no exact account can be given. The connection of the province with Rome points to the latter as the probable source of the first missionary efforts. In no region, probably, was a more rapid advance made by the Church than in this. As early as 258, Cyprian was able to assemble a North African council of eighty-

[1] Euseb., Hist. Eccl., v. 10.

seven bishops, and in 330 the schismatic Donatists alone held a council of two hundred and seventy bishops.

In Europe the labors of Paul extended Christianity into Macedonia and Greece, strengthened its position at Rome, and, according to an early belief, helped also to introduce it into Spain. Of the early stages of Christian history in Spain, no definite information is at hand; but the references of Irenæus[1] and Tertullian,[2] and the fact that the council of Elvira, in 305 or 306, was able to convene nineteen bishops, show that the gospel won early trophies in that land.

Gaul was probably evangelized from Asia Minor, near the middle of the second century. Flourishing churches existed at Lyons and Vienne in the time of Marcus Aurelius. According to Gregory of Tours, about the middle of the third century seven missionaries from Rome came into Gaul, one of whom, Dionysius, became Bishop of Paris. From Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, we learn that Christianity won converts from the Germans.[3] He probably referred, however, to Germans under Roman rule, and not to the tribes beyond the Rhine.

Christianity came to Britain soon after its establishment in Gaul; at least, Tertullian in his day, as we have seen, was able to witness that it was already to be found in the British Isles. The account of the Anglo-Saxon historian Beda indicates that missionaries from Rome were the evangelizing agency. He says: "Whilst Eleutherus presided over the Roman Church, Lucius, king of the Britons, sent a letter to him, entreating that by his command he might be made a Christian. He soon obtained his pious request; and the Britons pre-

[1] Cont. Hær., i. 10. 2. [2] Adv. Judæos, vii. [3] Cont. Hær., i. 10. 2.

served the faith which they had received, uncorrupted and entire, in peace and tranquillity, until the time of the Emperor Diocletian."[1] Beda's narrative, however, is founded on unreliable documents,[2] and lacks historical probability. The connection between the early British Church and Rome was by no means intimate.

Thus Christianity in the first three centuries penetrated into every corner of the Roman Empire, and in some directions passed beyond its bounds. What proportion of the population of the Empire it numbered among its adherents at the beginning of the fourth century cannot be stated with any degree of satisfaction. Estimates vary widely, from the "one-twentieth" of Gibbon to the "one-half" of Stäudlin. The latter is probably much too high, the former somewhat too low. Forbearing to name exact figures, we may content ourselves with the indubitable fact that the real strength of the Christians was much in excess of their relative numbers. Already, in confidence and hope, in moral and intellectual strength, they had become the rightful masters of the Empire.

II.—THE ATTACKS OF HEATHEN POWER.

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. x. 34). "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake" (Mark xiii. 13). Such was the prospect with which the Christians started forth. Such for long centuries was their experience in the world. It could not have been otherwise. An absolute antagonism existed between

[1] Book I, chap. iv. [2] Haddan and Stubbs, Councils, I. 25, 26.

the Christians and the world of that age, between the spiritual empire of Christianity and the heathen Roman empire. No settlement was possible save by the surrender of the one or the other.

Though heathen Rome tolerated very many religions, her intolerance toward Christianity was not properly an exception to her general policy. Her tolerance in no case was rendered unconditionally. She recognized no universal maxim with respect to the rights of the individual conscience. On the contrary, she steadfastly asserted that it was her prerogative to supervise the worship of the individual. Her most enlightened statesmen were agreed upon this point. Cicero lays down the following as a fundamental rule of administration: "Let no one have any gods by himself; neither to new or strange gods, unless they have been publicly adopted, let any private worship be offered."[1] Mæcenas is reported to have given this advice to Augustus: "Revere the gods in every way according to ancestral laws, and compel others so to revere them. Those, however, who introduce any thing foreign in this respect, hate and punish, not only for the sake of the gods, — want of reverence toward whom argues want of reverence toward every thing else, — but because such, in that they introduce new divinities, mislead many to adopt also foreign laws. Thence come conspiracies and secret leagues which are in the highest degree opposed to monarchy." The distinguished jurist, Julius Paulus, lays down as a fundamental article of Roman law: "Such as introduce new religions, whose bearing and nature are not understood, by which the minds of men are disquieted, should,

[1] De Legibus, ii. 8.

if they are of the higher ranks, be transported; if of the lower, be punished with death."[1] The right to persecute on the score of religious practice could not be more definitely asserted. That right was wrapped up with the Roman conception of the State. To the Roman, the State was the supreme idea. He knew practically nothing about a divine kingdom above and beyond this. If of a believing disposition, he worshipped the ancestral gods as patrons of the State and guardians of its eternal dominion; if sceptical, he was still strongly inclined to insist upon their worship as a thing of political necessity, a means of binding the less intelligent ranks to their allegiance to the State. A state religion was in general counted an essential factor of a state policy. Beyond the limits of this, a wide license might be granted. One polytheistic system can easily make concessions to another. Hence, Rome allowed conquered nations to retain the worship of their own gods. The Jew, for example, was free to worship Jehovah. But none were counted free to assail or to endanger the state religion. The Jew was prohibited by law from making proselytes from heathen Romans. Those who had an ancient national religion of their own were expected at least to be neutral. Those who had no religion that could claim such ancient and national associations might be called upon to show positive deference to the state religion. Now, as the Christians had never existed as a nation and developed a national religion, they seemed the least of all entitled to special privilege or exemption. Their stubborn refusal to make any concession to the state religion appeared to the rulers,

[1] Neander, vol. i.

at least to those of a truly Roman cast, as a piece of arrogant assumption, and a clear evidence of insubordination. This impression was much strengthened by the bond of unity which the Christians exhibited. They showed themselves to be one in a more emphatic sense than any other body of men. They stood before the government as an independent, close-bound association, an association animated also by a peculiar confidence and aggressiveness. An unwonted air of certitude was assumed by them. They did not ask doubtfully, with the sceptical philosophers of the age, What is truth? but proclaimed their undoubted possession of the truth in the gospel. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life, declare we unto you" (1 John i. 1–3). Claiming to represent the absolute religion, they appeared as the uncompromising foes of heathen idolatry, and aliens to the State so far as the State was linked with that idolatry. This explains why the most sweeping persecutions were urged on by some of the best of the emperors; for just those emperors who aspired to a vigorous and comprehensive administration felt obliged to oppose Christianity as foreign to the State, a system that utterly refused to amalgamate with their heathen institutions.

State policy, however, was far from being the only inciting cause to persecution. With the great mass of the people, blind prejudice, jealousy, superstitious fears, or material interests were the leading motives. They estimated the subject merely from a surface view. That the Christians were a peculiar class, holding themselves

aloof from the common amusements and vices, was enough to arouse their ill-will and suspicion. Priests and artisans who had a pecuniary interest in heathenism sought to magnify this prejudice. So the most abominable slanders were circulated against the Christians. Their isolation was attributed to misanthropy. They were stigmatized as haters of mankind. *Odium humani generis* was a standing charge against them. As they had no temples or images, they were reprobated as atheists. The seclusion which they naturally sought for their love-feasts and celebrations of the Lord's Supper was declared to be a covering for the most hideous crimes. The report was fostered, that at such gatherings they were accustomed to bind themselves into a criminal league by making a feast upon a slaughtered child, and then to give themselves up to the most shameless indulgence. Such monstrous fabrications could not, of course, preserve credit a great length of time among the more intelligent; but with the unthinking populace they served repeatedly as means of exciting to hatred and violence. The same class were ready, also, upon the instant, to lay every public calamity to the charge of the Christians. "They think," says Tertullian, "the Christians the cause of every public disaster, of every affliction with which the people are visited. If the Tiber rises as high as the city walls, if the Nile does not send its waters up over the fields, if the heavens give no rain, if there is an earthquake, if there is a famine or pestilence, straightway the cry is, 'Away with the Christians to the lion!'"[1] Even the more enlightened of the heathen shared in this superstitious prejudice,

[1] Apol., xl. Compare Ad Nationes, i. 9.

especially from the time of Marcus Aurelius, when the prospects of the Empire and heathen fanaticism assumed together a darker tinge. The philosopher Porphyry was not above imputing the continued ravages of a pestilence to the presence of the Christians, so obnoxious in his view were they to the gods.

Since the Christians were, at that time, confounded with the Jews, they no doubt suffered from the action of Claudius, in the year 53, by which many Jews were driven from Rome. Perhaps the cause of the expulsion was the intemperate opposition of the Jews to those who had embraced Christianity. "The Emperor Claudius," says Suetonius, "drove the Jews from Rome, because, excited by Chrestus, they kept up a continual uproar."[1] This language sounds very much like a mistaken interpretation of a dispute about Christus. The heathen, we are informed by Tertullian, frequently fell into the error of putting Chrestus in place of Christus.[2]

Still, the first decisive persecution is properly referred to Nero's reign. "Nero," says Tertullian, "was the first who assailed, with the imperial sword, the Christian sect."[3] His tyranny prepared the flaming portal through which the Christians entered upon the long and painful ordeal. In the month of July, in the year 64, a fire broke out in Rome which raged (with only a brief interval of cessation at the end of the sixth day) for nine days. The calamity was of appalling dimensions. A writer, whose youthful mind must have been deeply stirred by the news, if not by the sight itself, of the conflagration, thus describes its destructive sweep:

[1] Lives of the Cæsars, Claudius, xxv. [2] Apol., iii.; Ad Nationes, i. 3.
[3] Apol., v. Compare Scorpiace, xv.

"Of the fourteen sections into which Rome is divided, four were still standing entire, three were levelled with the ground, and in the seven others there remained but a few remnants of houses, shattered and half-consumed."[1] Nero himself was suspected of having been the willing cause of the awful calamity. Popular rumor represented that the imperial actor gorged his insane appetite for the theatrical with the spectacle of the burning city, delighted to see therein a reproduction of ancient tragedy, and even singing on the stage of his private theatre the "Destruction of Troy," at the very time that the flames were surging over homes and temples.[2] As the days passed, the murmurings grew loud and threatening. Nero found that even the lavish bounties which he bestowed upon the homeless multitudes were of no avail to turn aside accusation. A more effective expedient must be employed. Such an expedient was found in the sacrifice of the Christians. The hatred in which they were held would make it easy to fasten suspicion upon them; and, even if the crime of firing the city could not be proved against them, popular wrath could be satiated by the sight of their torments. That this was the motive at the basis of the Neronian persecution, is explicitly stated by Tacitus, who, while he shows his contempt for the Christians and his utter ignorance of their real character, indicates his belief that the charge connecting them with the conflagration of Rome was a mere pretence, a lying expedient of the Emperor. "Nero," he says, "to suppress the rumor against himself, pretended that the persons commonly called Christians, who were hated for their enormities, were guilty;

[1] Tacitus, Annal., xv. 40. [2] Tacitus, Annal., xv. 39.

and he punished them with exquisite tortures. . . . First those were seized who confessed [that they were Christians]; then on their information a great multitude were convicted, not so much of burning the city, as of hating the human race. And in their deaths they were made the subjects of sport, being covered with the hides of wild beasts and worried to death by dogs, or affixed to crosses, or set on fire and made to serve as nocturnal lights when day had departed. Nero offered his own gardens for that spectacle, and exhibited a circensian game, mingling with the common people in the habit of a charioteer, or standing in his chariot. Hence, a feeling of compassion arose toward the victims, though guilty and deserving the heaviest penalties, since they seemed to be cut off not so much for the public good as to gratify the cruelty of one man."[1] Incidental references to the barbarous spectacle are found also in the satires of Juvenal.[2]

The Neronian persecution seems to have been but a brief outbreak of savagery. So far as urged on by the Emperor, it was probably confined to Rome. Still, it could hardly be otherwise than that the enemies of the new religion in other places would take courage from the imperial example, and be made more forward to vent their spite against the hated sect. It is possible that the murderers of the faithful martyr Antipas (Rev. ii. 13) received an incentive from the bloody carnival at Rome. However received by the heathen, the news of the Neronian persecution produced everywhere profound emotions in the breasts of Christians. Nero appeared to them as the embodiment of the spirit of

[1] Annal., xv. 44. [2] i. 155, viii. 235.

Antichrist. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that in the subsequent history the belief came to the surface that he was again to make war upon the saints, being that very agent of Satan who was to afflict the Church on the eve of the glorious coming of Christ.[1]

Domitian (81–96), "a man," to use Tertullian's phrase, "of Nero's type in cruelty," was the second to raise a persecution against the Christians.[2] The same suspicion and covetousness which led him to visit exile and confiscation of property upon numbers of the heathen nobility urged him to like injustice against the Christians. His own cousin, Flavius Clemens, a man of consular rank, was executed, on the ground, as is supposed, of his Christian profession; and Domitilla, the wife of Clemens, was banished. According to Hegesippus, some grandchildren of Judas, the brother of the Lord, were summoned before the tyrant, who was apprehensive that they might venture to set up royal claims, as being of the Davidic lineage. Their poverty,

[1] Heathen thought went before Christian in the notion of Nero's re-appearance. For many years the rumor had place among the people that he was not really dead, and at the opportune moment would appear and reinstate himself in the rule of the Empire. This expectation found expression in the Sibylline verses. Dollinger claims that a Jewish rather than a Christian hand recorded it here; that no earlier Christian writer than Commodianus, in the middle of the third century, refers to it, and that it was brought to his notice by the Sibylline books (*First Age of the Church*). Lactantius, who says that it was held by some persons of extravagant fancy, connects it with these books (*De Mort. Persecut.*, ii.). Augustine indicates a new phase of belief on the subject, since he speaks of those who imagined that Nero was to re-appear in virtue of a resurrection from the dead (*De Civ. Dei*, xx. 19). For himself he found no warrant for a re-appearance of the tyrant, either as miraculously preserved or as raised to life.

[2] Euseb., iii. 17.

however, and rustic simplicity, disarmed the suspicions of the Emperor, and secured their release.[1]

The persecution under Trajan (99–117) was impelled by a very different spirit from that which inaugurated either of the preceding. Here a political motive was the mainspring. In order to clear the Empire of faction, Trajan sought to carry out the law against secret associations. The Christians were placed under this category, and hence were proscribed. The *animus* of the Government is clearly indicated by the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan. The former came to Asia Minor as governor of Bithynia and Pontus. Thence he wrote, about the year 110, to his imperial master that the land swarmed with Christians; the temples of the gods were deserted; every rank had its representatives among the new sect. As a great number were brought before his tribunal, he was incited to make a thorough investigation. Still, all the testimony he could obtain was the statement that the Christians were accustomed to meet in the morning of a stated day, to sing a hymn to Christ as their God, and to bind each other not to commit any crime; that they then departed, and were wont, prior to the recent edicts, to re-assemble later in the day to a simple and innocent meal. The application of torture to two female slaves, who fulfilled the office of deaconesses in the congregation, failed to elicit any further information, except as it strengthened the impression of the Roman governor that the Christians were devoted to an extravagant superstition.[2] Pliny intimated in his correspondence his preference for a mixture of kindness and severity in

[1] Euseb., iii. 19, 20. [2] Epist., x. 96 (97).

dealing with the peculiar sect. He would give them suitable opportunity to renounce their connection with Christianity, but visit them with punishment if they persisted. The Emperor approved his policy, and laid down the principle that the Christians should not be sought out, but when properly accused and convicted should be punished. "These people," he wrote, "should not be searched for; if they are informed against and convicted, they should be punished, yet so that he who shall deny being a Christian, and shall make this plain in action, — that is, by worshipping our gods, — even though suspected on account of his past conduct, shall obtain pardon by his penitence. Anonymous accusations, however, should not be allowed a place in any criminal process; for this would establish the worst of precedents, and is counter to our age."[1] In a twofold respect this rescript of Trajan is highly significant. It shows that the Government did not give credence to the popular calumnies against the Christians, and recognized no crime in them except their association as a religious sect. But, on the other hand, it advertised the intention of the Roman government to deny to Christianity a legal status. It distinctly recorded, if it did not introduce, the verdict that Christianity was a *religio illicita*. Notwithstanding, therefore, its appearance of moderation, the rescript of Trajan left a broad foundation for persecution. While it encouraged no one to search out the Christians, by denying their right to an existence it gave every one a legal right to turn accuser against them.

[1] In Pliny's Epistles, x. 97 (98).

Among the more distinguished victims of Trajan's persecution, ancient belief numbered Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, and Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch. The former is said to have been crucified after being subjected to manifold tortures.[1] The latter is supposed to have been thrown to the wild beasts at Rome. Such was the fate anticipated by himself, as appears from the epistles which he wrote on his way to the great capital, especially from that to the Romans. These writings indicate that he was a man of fiery soul and commanding confidence. With an elevated and fearless devotion, he joined a somewhat intemperate thirst after martyrdom. He wished his friends at Rome to attempt no intervention in behalf of his life. "Do not seek," he says, "to confer any greater favor upon me than that I be sacrificed to God while the altar is still prepared. Suffer me to become food for the wild beasts. I am the wheat of God; and let me be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. Let fire and cross, let the crowds of wild beasts, let all the dreadful torments of the devil, come upon me: only let me attain to Jesus Christ. All the pleasures of the world, and all the kingdoms of this earth, shall profit me nothing. It is better for me to die in behalf of Jesus Christ than to reign over all the ends of the earth. I have no delight in corruptible food, nor in the pleasures of this life. I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; and I desire the drink of God, namely, His blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life."[2]

[1] Euseb., iii. 32. [2] Epist. ad Rom. *passim.*

Hadrian (117–138) followed the policy of his predecessor. In the early part of his reign, the Christians suffered in some of the provinces from perfidious accusations and tumultuous assaults. These the Emperor discouraged, and insisted upon legal methods. Perhaps his favorable action was due, in some degree, to the apologies of Quadratus and Aristides, the first apologies known to have been written in behalf of Christianity. Still, the position of the Christians was the reverse of secure. A sword was ever suspended above their necks, and rarely did persecution come to a complete standstill. Distinguished victims are said to have fallen at Rome, — among them the Bishop Alexander and the family of Getulius and Symphorosa. The last bore herself like the mother celebrated in the history of the Maccabees. Rather than participate in the heathen sacrifice, she chose the fate of her husband, who already had been put to death; and her seven sons, who were arraigned with her, followed her example, and were also executed.

The great revolt of the Jews under Hadrian, resulting to them in fearful slaughter, in the sale of many into slavery, and the complete banishment of the nation from Jerusalem, brought a fierce, though temporary, persecution upon the Christians of Palestine. The false Christ, Barcochba, the leader of the insurrection, was animated by a fanatical hatred of Christianity; and as a contemporary, Justin Martyr, testifies, "gave orders that Christians should be led to cruel punishment unless they would deny Jesus Christ, and utter blasphemy." [1]

[1] 1 Apol., xxxi.

Under Antoninus Pius (138–161), a similar course of events appeared. In certain of the provinces, hatred of the people, stimulated by public calamities, over-rode the legal methods of procedure. In Greece, a persecution broke out, during which Publius, the Bishop of Athens, among others, was sacrificed. But the Emperor reprobated all disorder, and, in the spirit of Trajan, insisted upon legal prosecution. If the account of Eusebius could be trusted, he even went so far in his clemency as to decree that no Christian should be molested on the mere ground of his religion.[1] But the decree cited by Eusebius is of doubtful authority.

The noted persecution at Smyrna probably took place during the rule of Antoninus Pius. Eusebius, it is true, locates it in the reign of Marcus Aurelius.[2] But a preponderance of evidence supports the conclusion that it occurred in the year 155.[3] The outbreak had its occasion largely in the resentment of the heathen masses. Although the proconsul was not immoderately bitter against Christianity, spurred on by the popular fury he sent a number to fearful tortures and deaths. Some were thrown to the wild beasts, some burned at the stake. But, according to the memorial of the church, the grace given to the martyrs was equal to their sufferings. "Not one of them let a sigh or groan escape them; thus proving to us all that those holy martyrs of Christ, at the very time when they suffered such torments, were absent from the body, or, rather, that the Lord then stood by them and communed with

[1] Hist. Eccl., iv. 13.
[2] Hist. Eccl., iv. 15.
[3] See Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, Part II. vol. i. pp. 629–702.

them."[1] Among those condemned to the fire was the venerable bishop Polycarp. He died in a manner worthy of his relation as a disciple of the Apostle John. Refraining from a rash zeal for martyrdom, he prudently sought to escape the persecutor until it seemed evident to him that the providential hour had come. To him it was an hour of joy and thanksgiving, rather than of grief, which summoned him to the stake. "O Lord God Almighty," he said in his dying ascription, "the Father of thy beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, by whom we have the knowledge of thee, the God of angels and powers, and of every creature, and of the whole race of the righteous who live before thee, I give thee thanks that thou hast counted me worthy of this day and this hour, that I should have a part in the number of thy martyrs, in the cup of thy Christ, unto the resurrection of eternal life."

The reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (161–180) was a trying era for the Christians, at least in some parts of the Empire. At first thought, this seems contrary to what might have been expected from the administration of the mild and philosophic Emperor. Unquestionably, he was one of the noblest spirits that ever was intrusted with the Roman sceptre. Rarely has a ruler proposed for his own guidance a more excellent set of maxims. He warned himself against contracting the stain of the purple, and exhorted himself to cultivate every manly and social virtue. "Keep thyself," he wrote in his Meditations, "simple, good,

[1] The Martyrdom of Polycarp, a letter sent forth by the church of Smyrna. Eusebius quotes it largely in his Church History, iv. 15. It may be regarded as genuine, though not wholly free from interpolations.

pure, serious, free from affectation, a friend of justice, a worshipper of the gods, kind, affectionate, strenuous in all proper acts." [1] "Every moment think steadily, as a Roman and a man, to do what thou hast in hand with perfect and simple dignity, and feeling of affection and freedom and justice, and to give thyself relief from all other thoughts; and then wilt thou give thyself relief, if thou doest every act of thy life as if it were the last, laying aside all carelessness and passionate aversion from the commands of reason, and all hypocrisy and self-love and discontent with the portion which has been given to thee." [2] "Never value any thing as profitable to thyself which shall compel thee to break thy promise, to lose thy self-respect, to hate any man, to suspect, to curse, to act the hypocrite, to desire anything which needs walls and curtains." [3] In a variety of terms, he asserted the claims of human brotherhood, and urged to the practice of disinterested benevolence. "All things," he said, "are implicated with one another, and the bond is holy." [4] "We are made for co-operation, like feet, like hands, like eyelids, like the rows of the upper and the lower teeth. To act against one another, then, is contrary to nature; and it is acting against one another to be vexed, and to turn away." [5] "Men exist for the sake of one another. Teach them, then, or bear with them." [6] "One thing here is worth a great deal, — to pass thy life in truth and justice, with a benevolent disposition even to liars and unjust men." [7] "When thou hast done a good act, and another has received it, why dost thou still look for a third thing

[1] vi. 30. Translation by George Long.
[2] ii. 5. [3] iii. 7. [4] vii. 9. [5] ii. 1. [6] viii. 59. [7] vi. 47.

besides these, as fools do, either to have the reputation of having done a good act, or to obtain a return?"[1] Marcus Aurelius, to be sure, was not above the defective teachings of Stoicism. He believed in its pantheistic fatalism, so paralyzing, in the long-run, to the very virtue which is so vigorously inculcated by the Stoic system. He seems, however, for himself, to have escaped this paralyzing influence. The elevated maxims uttered by him were not mere words, but the expressions of earnest thought and feeling. Still, there are abundant reasons why he should not have been interested to spare the Christians. In the first place, he was not free from a philosophic pride, which naturally begot enmity against the zealous and uncompromising sect. Their patient endurance of suffering, we may well presume, was a stumbling-block to the philosophic superiority which he assumed. A spirit of unconscious jealousy was stirred up in his heart. This is scarcely concealed in the only passage in which he refers to the Christians. After speaking of the readiness which the soul ought to have to meet death, and the fate which is to follow death, whether that be extinction or continued existence, he adds: "This readiness should come from a man's judgment, not from mere obstinacy, as with the Christians, but considerately, and with dignity, and in a way to persuade another without tragic show."[2] Again, the political ideal of the philosophic Emperor urged to intolerance toward the Christians. In proportion as he was of a philosophizing temper, he was tenacious of an ideal. Now, it was a cardinal principle, in his political ideal, that the individual must unqualifiedly serve the univer-

[1] vii. 73. [2] xi. 3.

sal, must be subservient to the interests of the State. "In the case of every appearance of harm," he says, "apply this rule: If the State is not harmed by this, neither am I harmed."[1] "The end of all rational beings is to follow the reason and the law of the most ancient city and polity."[2] The conduct of the Christians, therefore, in refusing to accede to the idolatrous demands of the State, and in maintaining their close-bound community within the State, could seem to him only irrational stubbornness. Finally, the reign of Marcus Aurelius was marked, to a peculiar degree, by calamities and dangers. Earthquakes, inundations, and plagues desolated the Empire, and enemies threatened its overthrow. "Gloom and terror oppressed all hearts. There was a vague presentiment that the dominion of Rome would expire on the confines of the German forests." The superstitious fear excited by these adversities was enough to set the populace aflame against the Christians, and was not without its effect upon the conduct of the Emperor himself.

How far Marcus Aurelius was directly connected with the persecutions of his reign, stands somewhat in question. The friendly judgment of the Christians upon the Emperor in later times might be taken as implying that the severities came from the local authorities rather than from him.[3] But Neander concludes that back of the persecutions were special imperial edicts.

[1] v. 22. [2] ii. 16.

[3] The story that Marcus Aurelius in the latter part of his reign became favorably disposed to the Christians, because the prayers of a Christian legion saved his army by bringing the needed rain, is to be regarded as thoroughly disproved. The story is given by Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, iv., Apol., v., and by Eusebius, v. 5.

The severities actually inflicted, a law in the Roman collection which is assigned to the reign of this Emperor,[1] the declarations of Celsus,[2] and the references of Melito are the principal data which he adduces; and from these he draws the inference that the policy of Marcus Aurelius departed in two respects from that of Trajan, in that it prescribed that Christians should be sought out, and, instead of simply ordaining their punishment when proved to be guilty, authorized the application of torture in order to make them recant, the recantation being understood to forestall a capital sentence. The testimony of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, is in the form of an address to the Emperor, in which the hardships suffered by his co-religionists are thus depicted: "As never before, the race of the worshippers of God is pursued and harassed with new decrees in Asia. For shameless and greedy sycophants, finding a pretext in the edicts, plunder the innocent day and night. If this were done by your command, let it be granted that it is well, — for a just ruler would not decree injustice, — and we will gladly bear our allotment of death. We only make this request of you, that, having acquainted yourself with the authors of such a contention, you will decide righteously whether they deserve death and punishment, or safety and security. But if this decree and this new edict, which would not be

[1] The law does not name the Christians, but it is altogether probable that they were numbered with the religious disturbers against whom sentence of banishment is denounced. The law is indicated in these terms: "Si quis aliquid fecerit, quo leves hominum animi superstitione numinis terrerentur, divus Marcus hujusmodi homines in insulam relegari rescripsit."

[2] Quoted by Origen, Cont. Celsum, viii. 39, 69.

proper even against barbarous enemies, are not from you, so much the more we beseech you not to leave us to be plundered in this way by the populace."[1] It might be judged, from the conditional terms in which Melito refers to the edicts, that he doubted whether they emanated from the Emperor. His language, however, was quite likely not designed to give expression to real doubt, but only to avoid an appearance of excessive boldness in protesting against the edicts of his imperial Majesty.

Especially violent and fanatical was the persecution which fell upon the churches of Lyons and Vienne in Gaul, in the year 177. Tortured slaves were forced to false witness, and their testimony was used as a justification for barbarous severity toward every class of Christians. The aged bishop Pothinus, at Lyons, followed well the example which Polycarp had given. To the taunting question of the Legate, "Who is the God of the Christians?" he replied, "You will know when you are worthy." The slave virgin Blandina and the youth Ponticus showed a fortitude worthy of the highest rank and the maturest Christian life. In general, these churches were examples of the purer type of martyrdom. The confessors showed an exemplary humility. They declined the name of martyrs. Leaving that title to Him who died upon the cross, they said that they were but poor and ordinary confessors. With unfeigned desire they besought the prayers of their brethren, that they might be saved from denying their Lord. They were full of patience and mildness toward their persecutors. But nothing seemed able to produce relentings in their enemies. Satiety with slaughter alone

[1] Eusebius, iv. 26.

brought to an end the murderous work. Then mocking the hope of the resurrection, the heathen refused all requests for the privilege of burial, and throwing the ashes of the martyred Christians into the Rhone exclaimed, "Now we will see if they will rise again."[1] The martyrdom of Symphorian in the neighboring city of Autun probably occurred near the same time.

Among those who suffered at Rome under Aurelius was a leading apologist of the age, Justin Martyr. In him we see an example of that class of sincere inquirers after truth who easily stepped from philosophy to Christianity. According to his own account he had successively tried the Stoic, the Peripatetic, and the Pythagorean philosophy. Neither of these gave satisfaction. The Platonic was for a time more gratifying. "The perception of immaterial things," says he, "quite overpowered me; and the contemplation of ideas furnished my mind with wings, so that in a little while I supposed I had become wise." But one day an old man whom he met upon the shore of the sea unfolded to him a wisdom based on the oracles of God, and so superior that all his previous acquisitions seemed but emptiness in comparison. "Straightway," he says, "a flame was kindled in my soul, and a love of the prophets and of those men who are friends of Christ possessed me; and, whilst revolving his words in my mind, I found this philosophy alone to be safe and profitable."[2] In turning Christian, Justin had no idea that he was ceasing to be a philosopher. Christianity appeared to him the absolute philosophy, and he still retained his philosopher's mantle. His writings correspond to this habit. He falls natu-

[1] Euseb., v. 1, 2. [2] Dial. cum Tryph., i.-viii.

rally into philosophizing, sometimes to an extent beyond the demands of the occasion. Some of his paragraphs contain far-fetched ideas, and reveal an excess of allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures. But he abounds in noble conceptions, and gives evidence that he was a man of good mind and of broad and kindly temper. The martyrdom of Justin is supposed to have occurred about 165. According to Eusebius,[1] the enmity of the Cynic philosopher Crescens was the mainspring of the prosecution against Justin. He died as became the Christian philosopher.

Commodus (181–192), the worthless son of Marcus Aurelius, naturally had more concern to feed his own pleasures than to subdue the Christians. Moreover, a mistress by the name of Marcia is said to have been friendly toward the Christians, and to have disposed the Emperor to leniency. Still the laws were unrepealed; and probably this reign proved no exception to the words of Irenæus: "The Church in every place, because of the love which she cherishes toward God, sends forward, throughout all time, a multitude of martyrs to the Father."[2] Indeed, we read of the sacrifice of a Roman senator and of a proconsular persecution in Asia Minor.[3]

Septimus Severus (193–211) was favorable to the

[1] Hist. Eccl., iv. 16. It appears from his own words, 2 Apol., iii., that Justin anticipated his fate.

[2] Cont. Hær., iv. 33. 9.

[3] Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, v., represents that the proconsul was arrested in his persecuting design by the voluntary appearance of a great multitude of Christians before his judgment-seat. Ordering a few to be executed, he said to the rest, "O miserable men, if you wish to die, you have precipices or halters."

Christians at the beginning of his reign. Later he became sufficiently hostile to issue a decree forbidding under severe penalties the going over to Christianity. But, independent of the temper of the Emperor, the severe laws still standing gave large opportunity for local persecutions, and such raged with great fierceness in Egypt and North Africa. Clement of Alexandria, writing soon after the death of Commodus, testifies: "We see daily many martyrs before our eyes burned, crucified, beheaded."[1] Leonides, the father of Origen, perished in this Egyptian persecution. Potamiæna, a young woman of singular beauty, won general admiration by her constancy, and secured for Christ and martyrdom one of the soldiers who led her out to the place where she was tortured to death by boiling pitch. In North Africa, also, Christ was abundantly glorified by the heroism of his followers. Rarely has natural affection assailed a consecrated will with greater force than in the case of the young wives and mothers Perpetua and Felicitas. The sensibilities of the former in particular were sorely tried. On the one hand was an aged father beseeching her to spare his gray hairs, on the other the helplessness of her infant child calling for maternal nurture. But there was no wavering on the part of the meek heroine. Felicitas, in like manner, proved herself worthy of the crown.

The crazy Caracalla (211–218) was not disposed to molest the Church, and persecution occurred only at the instance of the local authorities. A time of comparative peace ensued. The reign of Maximin excepted, there was no serious discomfiture for the Christians till the

[1] Stromata, ii. 20.

middle of the century. Heliogabalus (218–222), who was himself a devotee of a foreign worship, being possessed with a fanatical preference for the impure Syrian worship of the sun, was not in a condition to persecute while absorbed in the effort to introduce his own rites among the heathen; and his death occurred before there was occasion for positive collision with the Christians. Alexander Severus (222–235), with his broad eclectic disposition, was naturally disposed to tolerance. Gordian, who succeeded the Thracian Maximin in 238, and Philip the Arabian (244–249), were mild toward the Christians. The latter, according to an early report, was himself a Christian.[1] But this is improbable. The silence of Origen, who was in communication with him, and the heathen pomp with which he celebrated the millennial year of Rome,[2] are counter to such a conclusion.

This unaccustomed rest led not a few to hope that the storm of persecution was finally passed. But the more far-seeing were able to perceive that a new outbreak was imminent. Origen, for example, predicted that a fiery ordeal was already being prepared for the Church. "It is probable," said he, "that the secure existence, so far as regards the world, enjoyed by believers at present, will come to an end, since those who calumniate Christianity in every way are again attributing the present frequency of rebellion to the multitude of believers, and to their not being persecuted by the authorities as in old times."[3]

Origen's prophecy was no sooner spoken than the fulfilment began. Decius Trajan (249–251) made the

[1] Euseb., vi. 34. [2] Gibbon, chap. vii. [3] Cont. Celsum, iii. 15.

thorough repression of Christianity a part of his plan of administration. His mind was fully possessed with the idea of restoration, the building up and fortifying of the Roman Empire on the plan of its ancient institutions. So large a foreign element as the Christians being considered a fatal hinderance to his scheme, their elimination was resolved upon as a political necessity. At first the whole effort was to frighten and to constrain into recantation. A limit was set before which all Christians were required to sacrifice to the heathen gods. If any fled before that time, they were subjected to sentence of perpetual banishment, and their property was confiscated. Those who remained and held fast to their faith were not generally executed at once. If they persisted after a prescribed respite, they were subjected to imprisonment and torture. But, as the persecution progressed, capital inflictions became frequent. Three Bishops of Rome, Fabian, Cornelius, and Lucius, fell in succession (the last two, however, under Gallus). The Bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch were also sacrificed. Origen suffered grievously at Tyre from imprisonment and tortures. Egypt had many martyrs, among others a married pair who were nailed to neighboring crosses, and encouraged each other during their lengthened agony. Many who had entered the Church in the time of repose showed lack of courage and fortitude. The first stages of the persecution revealed the need of a sifting process. But many also glorified Christ by witnessing a good confession.[1]

The death of Decius hardly secured a breathing space for the Christians. His successor, Gallus, was quite as

[1] Euseb., vi. 39–42.

little disposed to tolerance. It was, however, as a purified body that the Church now met the storm. Defections from the faith were rare. Some who previously had been wanting confirmed their repentance by steadfastness even unto death. "How many," writes Cyprian, "who had fallen have been restored by a glorious confession!" [1]

Valerian (253–260) spared the Christians during the first years of his reign, but ere the close became as determined as Decius had been for their extirpation. He considered that it would be an effective piece of strategy, and one sparing of bloodshed, to deprive the Church of its leaders. His first step, therefore, was the banishment of the bishops. This was found to effect but little. The banished bishops continued by letter in communication with their flocks, and were loved all the more on account of their sufferings. Severer measures were therefore decreed. It was ordered that bishops, presbyters, and deacons should forthwith be executed with the sword; that senators and knights should lose their rank and property, and, in case they remained Christian, should in like manner be executed; that women of rank should suffer confiscation of property and banishment; that Christians serving at the imperial court should be treated as the property of the Emperor, and sent to work in chains upon his estates.[2] Among the first-fruits of this edict was the death of the Roman bishop Sixtus, and four deacons of his church (August, 258). The most distinguished victim, however, was Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. During the Decian persecution, he had retired before the storm, considering

[1] Epist., lvi., Ad Cornelium. [2] Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte, i. § 55.

that he could better serve his flock by this exercise of prudence. Now he believed that his hour had come. "God be praised," was his response as the proconsul pronounced sentence of death. His administration fell in one of the stormiest periods of the Church. The difficulties of his position were also increased by internal dissensions among the Christians of Carthage. It is the praise of Cyprian that he met the exigency with equal wisdom and firmness. Persuasive eloquence, practical sagacity, and strength of will, fitted him in a high degree for executive efficiency. He had less of mental force and alertness than Tertullian, whom he regarded as his theological master; but he was better fitted for discreet administration. Perhaps he laid too much stress upon the episcopal office. This, however, flowed from his conviction of the need of a strong government and an efficient bond of unity in the Church. He appears, on the whole, an eminent example of the high-minded and able bishop.

Upwards of forty years of comparative rest for the Church followed the Valerian persecution. Gallienus, the son and successor of Valerian, allowed the Christians the free use of their religion, and restored confiscated property to the different congregations,[1] — an act really equivalent to making Christianity a lawful religion, since on Roman principles only legal corporations could hold joint property. The Emperor Aurelian came near interrupting this comfortable status, but the hand of an assassin prevented the execution of his persecuting design (275).[2] Again the Church began to

[1] Euseb., vii. 13.
[2] Compare Euseb., vii. 30, with Lactantius, De Mort. Persecut., vi.

dream that the fearful shadow had forever vanished. But an ordeal as severe as any which had been endured was being prepared. In extent and cruelty, the Diocletian persecution was a fit close to the attempts of heathen power to exterminate Christianity.

Diocletian belonged to that class of emperors who had a sincere regard for the welfare of the Empire. In promoting that welfare, however, he was not governed by a conservative spirit, and chose his own methods. He introduced a great change, both in the idea of the imperial office and the plan of the imperial administration. The former, he, so to speak, orientalized, cultivating in every way the impression that the emperor held his place not by the gift of people, senate, or soldiery, but by divine right. To the administration he gave a peculiar cast by his system of co-emperors. Feeling that "a single head can be severed at a single blow," that the fact that only one man needed to be removed, in order to make vacant the highest place in the world, was a constant temptation to conspiracy and assassination, he resolved upon a plan of associate rulers. In all, four were to hold the reins of power, — two under the superior title of Augustus, and two under the title of Cæsar. In this his design was not to divide the Empire into several kingdoms, "but to quadruple the personality of the sovereign."[1] The Augustus at Nicomedia, the Augustus at Milan, the Cæsar on the eastern, and the Cæsar on the western border, were reckoned as constituting one sovereignty. The laws were issued under the names of both Augusti, and one of these names always stood first in order. Promotions were to take

[1] A. J. Mason, The Persecution of Diocletian.

place in the order of seniority; and, when the imperial dignity had been held for twenty years, there was to be a voluntary resignation.

Diocletian himself, though not above being influenced by pagan superstitions, was averse to beginning a general persecution of the Christians. But his son-in-law, the eastern Cæsar Galerius, was a man of ignorant and fanatical zeal for heathenism, and placed no bounds to his hatred of Christianity. In answer to his repeated urging,[1] Diocletian at length took the first step; and, the first step being taken, retreat was next to impossible, short of a desperate attempt to destroy the Church. On the 23d of February, 303, a company of soldiers proceeded to the cathedral church of Nicomedia, the city of the imperial residence, and levelled the noble edifice to the ground. The next day a decree was issued, requiring the destruction of all Christian churches and all copies of the Bible, deposing from their position and abrogating the civil rights of all Christian officers, and reducing all Christians of ordinary rank to the legal status of slaves, in case they would not renounce their Christianity. A second edict (instigated by certain calamities, especially the breaking out of a fire in the palace, which was slanderously charged against the Christians) required the immediate seizure and imprisonment of all the officers of the Church. A third edict came in the form of an appendix to an amnesty to prisoners generally, such as it was customary to grant on great festival occasions.[2] This appendix stated that the

[1] So Lactantius represents, De Mort. Persecut., xi. Compare Euseb., Book VIII., appendix.

[2] So Mason contends, through a different description of the edict has sometimes been given.

amnesty was to apply to the Christian ministers, in case they would sacrifice; and to constrain them to sacrifice, any kind of torture might be used. A fourth edict, issued by the authority of the western Augustus, Maximian, and the Senate, advised that death and confiscation of property be visited upon all Christians who should refuse to sacrifice to the gods.

With the exception of Gaul, Britain, and Spain, the persecution was general. Constantius Chlorus was the Cæsar over that region, and, being favorable to the Christians, did little toward executing the edicts, beyond the destruction of churches. His son Constantine, who succeeded him in the midst of the agitation (306), was equally indisposed to severity. With intermissions, the persecution continued till the year 311, and in the most eastern districts, under Maximin, till 313. As is represented by Eusebius, the Christians were subjected to a long catalogue of horrors, some of which were witnessed by the historian himself. One of the more atrocious barbarities practised was the condemnation of Christian virgins to be abused in brothels. As was the case in the Decian persecution, which came after a long rest, many yielded to the pressure; but still a host were found capable of enduring all things in fidelity to Christ.

Though the boast was soon made that Christianity was destroyed, the plain facts of the case finally convinced the imperial persecutors themselves of their failure. Diocletian, who resigned his place in 305, saw the religion which he had attempted to extirpate more definitely and fully endowed with legal right than it had ever been previously. The misery of his closing

days was in pitiable contrast with his former greatness. Galerius upon his dying bed (311), suffering like a Herod Agrippa, issued an edict securing religious tolerance to the persecuted. The edict was a strange document, corresponding to the mixed emotions of the tortured Emperor, his hatred on the one hand toward the Christians, and his desire on the other to appease the Christians' God. "Singular document!" exclaims M. de Broglie, "in part insolent, in part suppliant, which begins with insulting the Christians, and ends with requesting them to beseech their Master for him."[1] The following were the closing words of the edict: "Wherefore, in consideration of this our indulgence, it will be their duty to pray to their God for our welfare, and the welfare of the State, and of themselves, that on all sides the State may be found in good condition, and that they may be able to live without anxieties in their own homes."[2] What was lacking in this decree was soon supplied. The edict of Milan, issued by Constantine in conjunction with the eastern Cæsar Licinius (January, 313), was a broad and explicit declaration of religious tolerance. "Having long since perceived," says the edict, "that religious liberty should not be denied, but that it should be granted to the judgment and the desire of each one to perform divine duties according to his own preference, we had given orders that each one, and the Christians among the rest, have the liberty to observe the religion of his choice, and his peculiar mode of worship." The edict then goes on to state that the limitations contained in the former decree are

[1] Quoted by Mason.
[2] Euseb., viii. 17; Lactantius, De Mort. Persecut., xxxiv.

to be regarded as cancelled, so that the most unrestricted freedom of worship is assured to the Christians. Command is also given for the restoration of the corporate property which had been taken from the churches.[1]

The issue of the Diocletian persecution demonstrated that Christianity was unconquerable. It came now by right to the throne of the Cæsars. By long, patient, and victorious resistance to the exterminating efforts of heathen power, it had proved itself the child of Providence. Above all other causes of its success shines forth its inherent Heaven-born virtue. The five causes assigned by Gibbon[2] may be allowed a place; namely, (1) the inflexible zeal of the Christians coming in a purified form from the Jewish religion, (2) the doctrine of the future life set forth in a most effective manner, (3) the miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Church, (4) the pure and austere morals of the Christians, (5) the union and discipline of the Christian republic. But the admission of these causes by no means excludes a higher element, or reduces the establishment of Christianity in the world to a mere natural phenomenon. What brought about the concurrence of these five causes? What caused the causes themselves, the zeal, the vivid sense of the future life, the pure morals, the fraternal union? Surely the explanation most satisfactory to an unbiassed judgment is that which points to the supernatural origin and virtue of Christianity.

The statement of Gibbon, that the victims of the Spanish persecution in a single province and in a single reign probably outnumbered the martyrs of the first

[1] Euseb., x. 5; Lactantius, De Mort. Persecut., xlviii. [2] Chap. xv.

three centuries,[1] needs to be verified by a much greater array of evidence than he has given. Only the distance of the field of these early conflicts, and the scantiness of memorials, can save to such a conclusion a color of plausibility. Were it not for the more ample records of the modern era, some future Gibbon might make out a very fair showing for the verdict that only a few hundreds were sacrificed by Spanish bigotry. No doubt there were in the modern persecutions elements of unrelenting severity, as well as of judicial mockery, which did not pertain to the earlier. A Roman magistrate would have been ashamed to employ some of the methods freely used by the Inquisition. Still, the minifying estimate of Gibbon is in no wise justified. Roman intolerance may not have made as great a havoc as has been sometimes imagined; nevertheless, the victims were many. Efforts at extermination, such as were conducted under Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian, at times when the Christians were numbered by the million, together with the local persecutions which broke out at intervals during two centuries and a half, must have resulted in the sacrifice of great multitudes. But the number executed is no proper measure of the suffering endured. The slandered, the tortured, the imprisoned, those condemned to slavish toil, were in many cases less fortunate than those upon whom was visited the penalty of death. It was the heroic age of the Church, the age of sanctified endurance. Many chapters were written here which cover the name of Christian with peculiar lustre. Detracting phases are indeed apparent. Even the martyr zeal was sometimes

[1] Chap. xvi.

corrupted. Illustration was given of the truth that long-continued persecution is not wholly a purifying agency. Some, especially in connection with the later ordeals, were betrayed into a kind of theatric and ostentatious temper, and inclined to a fanatical over-estimate of martyrdom. The better part of the Church, indeed, protested against this perversion. "Needless exposure to persecution," writes Clement of Alexandria, "makes one an accomplice in the crime of the persecutor."[1] "Martyrdom," said Cyprian to his flock, "is not in your power, but in the condescension of God." In the divine judgment, too, the merit of martyrdom is not dependent upon an outward occasion for suffering or death. "It is one thing for the spirit to be wanting for martyrdom, and another for martyrdom to have been wanting for the spirit. God does not ask for our blood, but for our faith."[2] The result, however, despite these wholesome maxims, was a tendency at the close of the persecutions, in no inconsiderable part of the Church, to superstitiously laud the virtue of martyrdom, and to render undue honors to the memories of those who had suffered. But giving full weight to the disparaging features, there is still an ample balance on the side of the persecuted Church. Beyond doubt, from this field of bloody strife tens of thousands were exalted to a place in the company of those who have come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

[1] Strom., iv. 10.

[2] De Mortalitate, xvii. Compare Epist., lxxxii. (in Ante-Nicene Library).

III.—ATTACKS OF HEATHEN AUTHORS.

The irreconcilable opposition between heathenism and Christianity found illustration in the literary sphere as well as in that of civil relations. If the contest here was less marked, it was because heathen mind was less ambitious, and less capable of conducting a conflict with Christianity, than heathen power. It was easier, on the whole, to refute with fire and sword and the torture-rack than with arguments.

Some of the writers contemporary with early Christianity have left no allusion to it whatever in their works. So Seneca, the elder Pliny, and Plutarch. Tacitus has no higher terms for it than *exitiabilis superstitio*,[1] Suetonius styles it *superstitio malefica*,[2] and the younger Pliny is scarcely more complimentary, calling it *superstitio prava et immodica*.[3] Marcus Aurelius, as we have seen, acknowledged the fearlessness with which the Christians met death, but reprobated their courage as the product of a blind and unthinking enthusiasm.[4] The Stoic Arrhian wrote in much the same vein.

Lucian, in the second half of the second century, gave a somewhat more extended notice of Christianity. He treated it as might be expected of an Epicurean humorist, not with hatred, but with infidel pleasantry. From the stand-point of his materialistic scepticism, all forms of religious belief were only differently colored vagaries; all alike were deserving of ridicule. His caricature of Christianity is of a piece with the heaped-up sarcasms which he bestows on the heathen mythol-

[1] Annal., xv. 44.
[2] Nero, xvi.
[3] Epist., x. 96 (97).
[4] Meditations, xi. 3.

ogies. As all faith, in his view, was folly, he pictures the Christians as a simple-minded set, good-natured indeed, but given up to delusion in thought and in practice. Among their delusions he ridicules in particular their wonderful brotherly love and their confident hope of immortality. To put his sarcasms in the most piquant form, he brings forward a strange genius, Peregrinus Proteus, who goes through various adventures, holds temporarily a place in the Church, experiences as a prisoner the lavish charity of the Christians, is afterwards expelled from their communion, takes up the role of a Cynic philosopher, and finally ends his life by a voluntary and ostentatious leap into the fire in the presence of a great multitude. After telling in a humorous way how his brethren of every class flocked to the prison of Peregrinus, while he was in durance for the faith, he gives this estimate of the Christians: "These people, in all such cases, where the interest of the whole community is concerned, are inconceivably alert and active, sparing neither trouble or expense. Accordingly, Peregrinus by his imprisonment amassed money to a large amount, in consequence of the presents that were sent him, and raised a considerable income from it. For these poor people have taken it into their heads, that they shall, body and soul, be immortal and live to all eternity; thence it is that they contemn death, and that many of them run voluntarily into his clutches. Besides, their original legislator taught them that they were all brothers when they had taken the great step to renounce the Grecian deities, and bow the knee to their crucified sophist, and live in conformity to his laws. All things else they

despise in the lump, holding them vain and worthless, without having a competent reason for being attached to their opinions."[1]

Another attack from the seat of the scornful, but more extended, and based upon a larger knowledge of Christianity, came from the eclectic philosopher Celsus,[2] who lived about the same time as Lucian. His elaborate treatise, entitled a "True Discourse," was early destroyed; but its contents are well indicated by the quotations of Origen, who took pains to answer it, proposition by proposition. The work of Celsus was written in a spirit of intense hatred, and spares no thrust which criticism, calumny, and sarcasm could supply. Some of his strictures are such as a superficial rationalism always employs as a choice part of its stock in trade.

Celsus goes through the whole round of accusation. Master and disciple are equally slandered. Judaism and Christianity are both attacked; but the former is first subsidized for an assault upon the latter, and a Jew is made to utter every biting criticism which the more fanatical of his party might be imagined capable of producing. Christ is represented as the child of an adulterous connection between Mary and a Roman soldier. His ministry was that of an intentional deceiver, a "God-hated sorcerer," who learned his trade of working lying wonders in Egypt.[3] The claim that he was a

[1] The Lifes-End of Peregrinus, translated by William Tooke.

[2] Origen speaks of Celsus as an Epicurean philosopher, though not always confining himself to Epicurean tenets in his polemic against Christianity (*Cont. Celsum*, i. 8). He appears to have drawn much from Platonism.

[3] Cont. Celsum, i. 28, 32, 71.

divine being, the Son of God, is in every way preposterous. This claim, on the one hand, rests on a baseless assumption as to man's worth. It assumes that all things were made for men, that men are of unspeakable account in the eyes of God. Arrogant assumption! "Irrational animals are more beloved by God than we." "All things were not made for man, any more than they were made for lions, eagles, or dolphins. God is no more angry on account of men than on account of apes or flies." He only cares for the world as a whole, and the world as a whole grows neither better nor worse.[1] A divine incarnation argues an incredible and needless degradation of God. "No God, or Son of God, either came or will come down."[2] On the other hand, the divine claims of Christ are positively refuted by the facts of His life and death. He "obtained his living in a shameful and importunate manner," in the company of "the wickedest of tax-gatherers and sailors.[3] His life is a spectacle of impotence, contradictory on every side to the idea of divine strength. He could not even gain over His own disciples.[4] He was powerless to avert a most shameful death.[5] Think of the Son of God being nailed to a cross, *God* showing himself powerless to execute His threats against a disobedient nation in any better way than this; "whereas a *man* who became angry with the Jews slew them all, from the youth upwards, and burned their city!"[6] The claim to divinity is also contradicted by the inability of Christ to defend His followers. What help does He afford? "Do you not see [Christian] that even your own demon is not

[1] Cont. Cel., iv. 63, 85, 97, 99. [2] v. 2. [3] i. 62.
[4] ii. 39. [5] ii. 9. [6] iv. 73.

only reviled, but banished from every land and sea; and you yourself, who are, as it were, an image dedicated to him, are bound and led to punishment, and fastened to the stake, whilst your demon, or, as you call him, the Son of God, takes no vengeance on the evil-doer?"[1] Never did a people appear more forsaken than this sect of the Nazarenes. "If any of you transgresses even in secret, he is sought out and punished with death"[2] (a very emphatic testimony, by the way, from the heathen side, as to the severity of heathen persecution). The story of the resurrection is a very poor expedient to help out the claim of Christ. Who were the witnesses of that event? "A half-frantic woman, as you state, and some other one, perhaps, of those who were engaged in the same system of delusion, who had either dreamed so, owing to a peculiar state of mind, or under the influence of a wandering imagination had formed to himself an appearance according to his own wishes."[3] How strikingly at this point Celsus anticipates Renan! The "half-frantic woman" of the former is only a less refined expression for the French critic's "Mary [who] alone loved enough to pass the bounds of nature, and revive the ghost of the perfect Master."

In the opinion of Celsus, the followers of the "God-hated sorcerer" rank no better than their chief, except as their ignorance may serve to excuse them. He counts it a piece of irrational stubbornness in the Christians that they should persist in maintaining their religion contrary to the laws of the State.[4] He charges them in particular with preferring ignorance to knowl-

[1] Cont. Cel., viii. 39. [2] viii. 69. [3] ii. 55. [4] i. 1; v. 34.

edge, the vile to the righteous. Their maxims, he says, are of the following nature: "Do not examine, but believe!" "Your faith will save you." "The wisdom of this life is bad, but foolishness is a good thing."[1] "Those who invite to a participation in other mysteries," he continues, "make proclamation as follows: 'Every one who has clean hands and a prudent tongue;' others, again, thus: 'He who is pure from all pollution, and whose soul is conscious of no evil, and who has lived well and justly.' Such is the proclamation made by those who promise purification from sins. But let us hear what kind of persons these Christians invite. Every one, they say, who is a sinner, who is devoid of understanding, who is a child, and, to speak generally, whoever is unfortunate, him will the kingdom of God receive."[2] The number of parties, or factions, found among the Christians is also cited as a ground of reproach.[3]

Many of the objections of Celsus, it is to be observed, were really of the nature of compliments to Christianity. They serve to illustrate how far the plane of the Christian religion is above that of an unspiritual philosophy, since they originated in the inability of the pagan critic to appreciate either the nobility of the Divine condescension, or the fitness of human condescension to men of low estate.

An attack in a somewhat profounder spirit came from Porphyry of Tyre, a representative of Neo-Platonism in the latter part of the third century. This was the philosophy of the heathen revival, which began in the latter half of the second century, and its character cor-

[1] Cont. Cel., i. 9; iii. 18, 44. [2] iii. 59. [3] iii.10.

responded to its age and associations. Unlike the earlier philosophies, it assumed a distinctively religious cast; it patronized the heathen religion, and sought a rational interpretation of its mythology; it recognized man's craving after the supernatural, and was possessed with a spirit of ready assent to what appeared to be tokens of the supernatural. Eclectic in spirit, it did not shun to borrow, to a certain extent, from Christianity. Still, it was radically hostile to Christianity. It favored the persecuting policy of the Roman government. One of its representatives, Hierocles, was a prominent instigator and agent of the Diocletian persecution. It treated with scorn the claim for exceptional reverence toward Christ, and sought to exhibit the religious heroes of heathenism as being still more deserving. Thus the life of the philosopher and magician Apollonius of Tyana was idealized and set forth as something rivalling the life depicted in the gospel history. Hierocles openly drew the parallel in the early part of the fourth century, with the design of exhibiting the superiority of the heathen teacher and wonder-worker.[1] The same design, as many critics conclude, lay at the basis of the biography of Apollonius, which Philostratus wrote near the beginning of the third century.[2] A like interest may perhaps be detected in the endeavor of Porphyry and Jamblichus to exalt Pythagoras beyond measure.

Unlike Celsus, Porphyry ascribed to Christ the char-

[1] Lactantius, Inst. Div., v. 2, 3.

[2] Opinion is not unanimous as to the conscious intent of Philostratus. A brief summary of the evidence in favor of the conclusion expressed above may be found in Pressensé, Martyrs and Apologists, Book III., chap. i.; J. H. Newman, Historical Sketches, vol. ii.

acter of a noble and sincere teacher of the truth. We are not to calumniate him, but only to pity those, who, in pursuance of a delusion which fate has brought upon them, worship him as God since his exaltation to heaven. From such fragments as remain of his work against Christianity, Porphyry seems to have made a special effort to invalidate the authority of Scripture, and to disparage the apostles as compared with their Master. He denied the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, emphasized the disagreement between Peter and Paul at Antioch as being contradictory to the authority of their teaching,[1] alleged that the repudiation of sacrifices by Christians was out of harmony with their prescription in the Old Testament,[2] and questioned whether the doctrine of eternal punishment could be reconciled with the rule of proportionate penalty which Christ himself enunciated.[3] He also intimated that the late appearance of Christ in the history of the race agrees ill with the supposition of necessary dependence upon him for salvation.[4]

Hierocles, who wrote in the time of the Diocletian persecution, though assuming to deal with Christianity in a friendly and candid way, was less remote than Porphyry from the tactics of Celsus. As Lactantius represents, he ventured to assail Christ himself, as well as his followers, with odious accusations.[5]

[1] Jerome, Epist., cxi. 6 (Migne). [2] Augustine, Epist., cii. [3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid. Compare Jerome, Epist., cxxxiii.
[5] Inst. Div., v. 2, 3. See also Euseb., Adv. Hieroclem.

IV.—CHRISTIAN APOLOGY.

The early Christians were ready to give a reason for their faith and their conduct. Celsus spoke slanderously when he said of them that they reprobated investigation, and cried only, "Believe!" A long list of apologists, held in honor by the Church, refutes the charge. A narrow-minded party may have depreciated any argumentative defence of Christianity; but those who embodied the enlightened sentiment of the Church were willing to take their cause before the bar of reason, and attest its divinity by argument, as well as by holy living and patient suffering. "The representatives of the new religion did not allow a single accusation, a single objection, to fall to the ground: they overcame pagan philosophy with its own weapons." [1]

Soon after the days of the apostles, apologetic treatises began to appear. Some of the earlier are known only by reputation, or by brief citations. This is true of the apologies of Quadratus, Aristo, Miltiades, and Apollinaris of Hierapolis. The apology of Aristides was recently discovered in Syriac, and a large part of the Greek text identified. Of Melito's numerous writings little remains. The so-called apology which has been found under his name in a Syriac version appears not to have been the apology which is quoted by Eusebius, and indeed, according to the verdict of some of the most competent investigators, is not to be assigned to Melito at all. The anonymous epistle to Diognetus was probably one of the earliest specimens of the extant apologetic literature. Near the same time, appeared the

[1] Pressensé.

writings of Justin Martyr, defending Christianity before the bar both of heathenism and Judaism. Then followed, in the Greek Church, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. In the Latin Church, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, and Arnobius were the most conspicuous in this order of writing. Lactantius was also a noted apologist; but, as a Christian writer, he belonged to the beginning of the next period.

The apologists differed noticeably among themselves as respects their appreciation of heathen culture. Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athenagoras, and Minucius Felix are examples of the most favorable estimate. Writers of this class conceived that the divine Word, the universal Reason, which appears full-orbed in the Christian revelation, has shed some rays of light into the souls of all men. Especially in the Greek philosophers they recognized men who had been enriched with genuine glimpses of spiritual truths. They were not unconscious of the mass of errors with which these germs of truth were mingled; still, they took pleasure in pointing out the instances in which philosophy appeared to coincide with Christianity. That the noblest sayings of the philosophers had a certain affinity with the Christian religion, was, in their view, a valuable evidence for the supreme reasonableness of that religion. As examples of a less favorable estimate of heathen culture, we have Tatian among the Greeks, and Tertullian among the Latins. The latter, with his strongly marked characteristics, might be regarded as the founder of a special type of apologetics. He, too, honored the reason in man, but his confidence was

more in the unsophisticated reason than in the logic of the philosophers. The so-called philosophers were, in his view, rather patriarchs of heresy and falsehood than of the truth. Such true and valuable sayings as they may have uttered have come not so much from their professional speculation as from the reason native to men, and which even they have not always succeeded in repressing. Tertullian, nevertheless, was not so wholesale in his objections to the philosophers, but that he was ready to quote them when they appeared to be on his side of the question. Arnobius, also, was inclined to a very sharp criticism of heathenism, and sought rather to exhibit features calling for scorn and reproach than to find points of affiliation with Christianity. The worth of his apology, moreover, was impaired by an imperfect understanding of the Christian system. In some of its opinions, it is no exponent of the common thought of the early Church.

As might be expected, the apologies of the early Church contain some very palpable defects. Most of them exhibit an excess of allegorical interpretation. Some of the apologists were betrayed into quoting from spurious sources. Thus, we find writers as eminent as Justin Martyr, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria, employing the Sibylline prophecies as though the celebrated oracle of the heathen world had voiced all these testimonies in behalf of theistic and Christian faith,[1]

[1] The writings of Tertullian and Origen contain no instance of an attempt to support the Christian cause by quoting the prophecies of the Sibyl, and Minucius Felix and Cyprian do not so much as mention them. Eusebius indicates that their authority was questioned more or less, and apparently within Christian circles. (Compare Augustine, De Civ. Dei, xviii. 47; Cont. Faust., xiii. 2, 15; see, on the whole subject,

whereas it is understood that the great body of these writings were from the hands of Jews and Christians. Of course, it is nothing against the honest intent of these apologists that they drew from such a source. Their fault was simply that of a somewhat incautious zeal in employing the materials that came to their hands. But, whatever defects they may have embraced, the early apologies were, on the whole, a noble defence and commendation of Christianity. Much that they contain is by no means obsolete. Clement of Alexandria gives statements on the limits of demonstration,

J. H. Friedlieb, Die Sibyllinischen Weissagungen, introduction, followed by Greek text and German translation.) As examples of the Sibylline verses, we quote the following: —

"There is one only uncreated God,
Who reigns alone, all-powerful, very great,
From whom is nothing hid. He sees all things,
Himself unseen by mortal eye." (THEOPHILUS, *Ad Autol.*, ii. 36.)

"Blessed shall be those men upon earth
Who shall love the great God before all else, —
Blessing him when they eat and when they drink,
Trusting in this their piety alone;
Who shall abjure all shrines which they may see,
All altars and vain figures of dumb stones,
Worthless, and stained with blood of animals,
And sacrifice of the four-footed tribes,
Beholding the great glory of one God."
(JUSTIN MARTYR, *Cohort. ad Græc.*, xvi.)

"Prostrate on the ground Ephesus shall wail, weeping by the shore,
And seeking a temple that has no longer an inhabitant.

Isis, thrice-wretched goddess, thou shalt linger by the streams of the Nile;
Solitary, frenzied, silent, on the sands of Acheron.

And thou, Serapis, covered with a heap of white stones,
Shalt lie a huge ruin in thrice-wretched Egypt."
(CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Cohort.*, iv.)

Threats of judgment, like those quoted by Clement, are of frequent occurrence in the Sibylline books, the proud Roman capital itself not being spared.

and on the relations of faith and knowledge, and Origen, in his great reply to Celsus, abounds in considerations, which are to be recognized in any standard Christian apology.

In conducting their defence, the Christian apologists vindicated the attitude of Christians toward the State, showed up the weak points of heathenism, and brought forward the positive evidences for the truth and divinity of their own system of faith.

1. The Answer to the State. — According to a wide-spread calumny of the times, the Christians were guilty of criminal practices, shameless violations of the common laws of civilization. But in the eyes of the more intelligent, their great offence was undoubtedly that of being un-Roman. They did not appear to be of the State as a Roman State, and were therefore a stone of stumbling. It was just at this point that a justification was most demanded, and was most difficult to render. The position of the Christians compelled them to be in a measure un-Roman. It was impossible for them to be in the fullest sympathy with a heathen, persecuting State. Entire affiliation with the same could not occur without giving countenance to heathenism. Probably in some instances an over-scrupulousness was indulged. Civil and military duties were refused where they might have been accepted. Yet it was not a principle with the Church at large to proscribe this public service; and we know as a matter of fact that there were Christians in the Roman army, and Christians at various times in the employment of the imperial court. Still the position of the Christians was one of comparative isolation,

and, in connection with their refusal to sacrifice to the gods, drew upon them the charge of being enemies of the State.

In vindicating their conduct toward the State, the Christians, through their apologists, claimed in the first place a fair hearing. "We have come," writes Justin Martyr to the Emperor, "not to flatter you by this writing, nor to please you by our address, but to beg that you pass judgment after an accurate and searching investigation."[1] In a like spirit Tertullian, speaking to the Roman rulers in behalf of Truth, says, "She has no appeals to make to you in regard to her condition, for that does not excite her wonder. She knows that she is but a sojourner on the earth, and that among strangers she naturally finds foes; and, more than that, that her origin, her dwelling-place, her hope, her recompense, her honors, are above. One thing, meanwhile, she anxiously desires of earthly rulers, — not to be condemned unknown. What harm can it do to the laws, supreme in their domain, to give her a hearing? Nay, for that part of it, will not their absolute supremacy be more conspicuous in their condemning her even after she has made her plea? But if, unheard, sentence is pronounced against her, besides the odium of an unjust deed, they will incur the merited suspicion of doing it with some idea that it is unjust, as not wishing to hear what they may not be able to hear and condemn."[2]

Having thus invited investigation, they boldly challenged the accusers to point to any class of men who paid a more genuine respect to the government than was exhibited by the Christians. None, they affirmed,

[1] 1 Apol., ii. [2] Apol., i.

were in general so careful to obey the laws as this persecuted sect. "Here," says Tertullian to the heathen magistrates, "we call your own acts to witness, you who are daily presiding at the trials of prisoners, and passing sentence upon crimes. Well, in your long lists of those accused of many and various atrocities, has any assassin, any cutpurse, any man guilty of sacrilege or seduction or stealing bathers' clothes, his name entered as being a Christian too? Or, when Christians are brought before you on the mere ground of their name, is there ever found among them an ill-doer of the sort? It is always with your folk the prison is steaming, the mines are sighing, the wild beasts are fed; it is from you the exhibiters of gladiatorial shows always get their herds of criminals to feed up for the occasion. You find no Christian there, except simply as being such; or, if one is there as something else, a Christian he is no longer."[1] "Your sentences," he urges in another place, "import only that one has confessed himself a Christian. No name of a crime stands against us, but only the crime of a name."[2] Only where the requirements of the State were in violation of a higher law, did the Christians, it was claimed, assume the part of disobedience; and in such a case a true man is bound to disobey. So Origen argued in replying to the charge of illegal association. "The laws of the heathens," said he, "which relate to images and an atheistical polytheism, are 'Scythian' laws, or more impious even than these, if there be any such. It is not irrational, then, to form associations in opposition

[1] Apol., xliv.

[2] Ad Nationes, i. 3. Compare Justin Martyr, 1 Apol., iv.; Athenagoras, Legat., ii.

to existing laws, if done for the sake of the truth."[1] "It is a fundamental human right," says Tertullian, "a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his own convictions. It is assuredly no part of religion to compel religion."[2]

Even as regards honoring the person of the emperors, the Christians were able to assert that they in reality were not at all behind their adversaries. They could not, indeed, call him Lord, in the heathenish, idolatrous sense; but they were ready to acknowledge him as their earthly lord, and to pray for his prosperity. "Without ceasing," wrote Tertullian, "for all our emperors we offer prayer. We pray for life prolonged; for security to the Empire; for protection to the imperial house; for brave armies, a faithful senate, a virtuous people, the world at rest, — whatever, as man or Cæsar, an emperor would wish. We cannot but look up to him as called by our Lord to his office; so that on valid grounds I might say Cæsar is more ours than yours, for our God has appointed him."[3] Again, he boldly satirizes the pretended superiority of devotion to their rulers on the part of the heathen. "No breath of treason," says he, "is there ever in the senate, in the equestrian order, in the camp, in the palace. Whence, then, came a Cassius, a Niger, an Albinus? Whence they who beset the Cæsar between the two laurel groves? Whence they who practised wrestling, that they might strangle him? Whence they who in full armor broke into the palace, more audacious than all your Tigerii and Parthenii? If I mistake not, they were Romans; that is, they were not Christians. Yet all of them, on the very eve of their

[1] Cont. Celsum, i. 1. [2] Ad Scapulam, ii. [3] Apol., xxx., xxxiii.

treacherous outbreak, offered sacrifices for the safety of the Emperor, and swore by his genius, one thing in profession and another in the heart; and no doubt they were in the habit of calling Christians enemies of the State."[1]

To the objection that the State would be left defenceless, as this was urged by Celsus, if all did as the Christians, Origen replied that in that event the State would possess a security never realized before. "If all the Romans embrace the Christian faith, they will, when they pray, overcome their enemies." And as for the barbarians, "when they yield obedience to the word of God, they will become most obedient to the law, and most humane, and every form of worship will be destroyed except the religion of Christ, which will alone prevail. And indeed it will one day triumph, as its principles take possession of the minds of men more and more every day."[2]

2. Answers to Special Points of Heathen Criticism. — The popular calumnies against the Christians, charging them with the most abhorrent rites, seem not to have been urged by the more noted of the heathen critics. Christian apologists did not deem it necessary to consider them at much length. They stamped them as idle slanders, and boldly invited to judicial investigation. Tertullian aptly drew from inertness in pressing such investigation an evidence that the rulers did not believe the scandalous charges, and pointed in particular to the rescript of Trajan, forbidding search to be

[1] Apol., xxxv. Compare Ad. Scapulam, ii.
[2] Cont. Celsum, viii. 68–70.

made for Christians, as an open declaration that they were not to be accounted guilty of shameful or criminal practices.[1]

To heathen minds the cross was naturally an offence. To many also the doctrine of the resurrection was a stone of stumbling. In reference to the former, Christian apologists called attention to the fact that the cross is honored in both nature and art as a continually recurring form. The navigator must acknowledge his obligations to it as he sails over the sea; the soldier uplifts it in his standard; it is incorporated into the human body itself.[2] Wittingly or unwittingly every one pays tribute to the Christian sign. "As for him," says Tertullian, "who affirms that we are 'the priesthood of a cross,' we shall claim him as our co-religionist."[3] Objections to the resurrection were answered by an appeal to the analogies of nature, the parallel mystery of birth, and the omnipotence of God, as also to the fitness of making the body, which has been a partner with the soul in good and evil, a sharer in its glory and retribution.

The charge, as urged by Celsus, that Christianity showed an inveterate preference for the ignorant and the low, was nobly answered by Origen. He disclaimed utterly the notion that Christianity has any prejudice against knowledge. "Truly it is no evil," he says, "to have been educated, for education is the way to virtue."[4] He asserted also that it was a mistake to

[1] Apol., ii. Compare Ad Nationes, i. 2; Athengoras, Legat., iii.; Justin Martyr, 2 Apol., xii.

[2] Justin Martyr, 1 Apol., lv.

[3] Ad Nationes, i. 12. Compare Apol., xvi.

[4] Cont. Celsum, iii. 49.

suppose that among Christians a majority were men of specially bad antecedents, or that such were regarded as the most hopeful candidates for a Christian life.[1] At the same time he allowed that the Church bestowed great care upon the ignorant and the vicious, and justified its course in the most emphatic terms. "We acknowledge," he says, "that we *do* desire to instruct all men in the word of God, so as to give to young men the exhortations which are appropriate to them, and to show to slaves how they may recover freedom of thought, and be ennobled by the word. And those amongst us who are the ambassadors of Christianity sufficiently declare that they are debtors to Greeks and barbarians, to wise men and fools, in order that as far as possible they may lay aside their ignorance.[2] . . . Not to *participation in mysteries*, and to a *fellowship in the wisdom hidden in a mystery*, which God ordained before the world to the glory of his saints, do we invite the *wicked* man, and the *thief*, and the *housebreaker*, and the *poisoner*, and the *committer of sacrilege*, and the *plunderer of the dead*, and all those others whom Celsus may enumerate in his exaggerating style; but such as these we invite to be *healed*. For there are in the divinity of the word helps toward the cure of those who are sick."[3]

3. Criticisms urged against Heathenism. — It was an easy task for the apologists to point out the corruptions and follies of heathenism, and one which they fulfilled with no little effectiveness. They charged the heathen administration with a criminal indifference

[1] Cont. Celsum., iii. 65. [2] iii. 54. [3] iii. 61.

toward the abominable practice of exposing infants, and with fostering the trade in unnatural vice.[1] They cited the cruelties which were sometimes practised in the name of religion. Tertullian testifies, for example: "Children were openly sacrificed in Africa as lately as the proconsulship of Tiberius; and even now that sacred crime still continues to be done in secret."[2] The corrupting influence of the heathen mythologies was evident, they affirmed, to enlightened heathen themselves, so that Plato decided that the writings of Homer ought to be banished from the State.[3] The lives of their gods, they said, were largely narratives of follies, weaknesses, and vices, making it equally absurd and vitiating to the character to worship them. Their very forms and appearances, says Minucius Felix, argue their contemptible nature. "Vulcan is a lame god, and crippled; Neptune with sea-green eyes; Mercury with winged feet; Pan with hoofed feet; Saturn with feet in fetters; Janus wears two faces." Then think of their deeds and fortunes, the adulterous loves of Jupiter and his lewdness with Ganymede, the adultery of Mars and Venus, Apollo feeding the cattle of Admetus, Neptune hiring out to build walls, Mars wounded in battle, Jupiter needing to be set free by Briareus.[4] Tertullian accuses Homer of having "pitted the gods against each other with varying success like pairs of gladiators."[5] The irreverence of the heathen, in his own day, he pictures in these striking terms: "The family deities you call

[1] Justin Martyr, 1 Apol., xxvii.; Tertullian, Ad Nationes, i. 15.

[2] Apol., ix.

[3] Justin, 2 Apol., x.; Cohort. ad Græc., v.; Minucius Felix, Octavius, xxii.

[4] Octavius, xxi., xxii. [5] Ad Nationes, i. 10.

Lares, you exercise a domestic authority over, pledging them, selling them, changing them, — making sometimes a cooking-pot of a Saturn, a fire-pan of a Minerva, as one or the other happens to be worn or broken in its long sacred use, or as the family head feels the pressure of some more sacred home necessity. In like manner, by public law you disgrace your state gods, putting them in the auction-catalogue, and making them a source of revenue. Men seek to get the Capitol, as they seek to get the herb-market, under the voice of the crier, under the auction-spear, under the registration of the quæstor. Deity is struck off and farmed out to the highest bidder."[1] He instances also the degradation of the gods implied in the relation of Roman conquest to Roman worship. "The sacrileges of the Romans," he says, "are as numerous as their trophies. They boast as many triumphs over the gods as over the nations; as many spoils of battle they have still, as there remain images of captive deities. And the poor gods submit to be adored by their enemies."[2]

As already intimated, a number of the apologists did not deal with heathenism solely in the spirit of adverse criticism. Acknowledging such scattered truths as were to be found in the heathen world, they turned these into just so much evidence for Christianity, by interpreting them as the voice of the better nature in man, as the teaching of the Logos in His general operation in human souls, or as borrowings from the Old Testament.

[1] Apol., xiii.

[2] Ibid., xxv. Compare Ad Nationes, ii. 17; Minucius Felix, Octavius, xxv.

4. Positive Evidences for the Truth and Divinity of the Christian Religion. — The apologists appealed to the moral transformations wrought by Christianity in many cases, and to the pure lives of Christians in general, as a proof of the truth of their religion. The confidence and frequency with which they urged this argument is no mean indication that Christian living at that time was vastly superior to heathen living. "When false witnesses," says Origen, "testified against our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, He remained silent, believing that His whole life and conduct among the Jews were a better refutation than any answer to the false testimony. Jesus is at all times assailed by false witnesses, and, while wickedness remains in the world, is ever exposed to accusation. And yet even now He continues silent before these things, and makes no audible answer, but places His defence in the lives of His genuine disciples, which are a preeminent testimony, and one that rises superior to all false witnesses, and refutes and overthrows all unfounded accusations and charges."[1] Justin Martyr testifies in this wise to the beneficial change wrought by the gospel: "We who formerly delighted in fornication now embrace chastity alone; we who formerly used magical arts dedicate ourselves to the good and unbegotten God; we who valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and possessions now bring what we have into a common stock, and communicate to every one in need; we who hated and destroyed one another, and on account of their different manners would not live with men of a different tribe, now, since

[1] Cont. Celsum, Intro.

the coming of Christ, live familiarly with them, and pray for our enemies, and endeavor to persuade those who hate us unjustly to live conformably to the good precepts of Christ, to the end that they may become partakers with us of the same joyful hope of a reward from God, the ruler of all."[1]

The irresistible advance of Christianity in the face of every species of opposition and persecution was claimed by the apologists as an evidence of its Heaven-born character. "It is evident," said Justin Martyr, "that no one can terrify or subdue us who have believed in Jesus over all the world. For it is plain that though beheaded and crucified, and thrown to wild beasts, and chains, and fire, and all kinds of torture, we do not give up our confession; but the more such things happen, the more do others and in large numbers become faithful, and worshippers of God through the name of Jesus. For just as if one should cut away the fruit-bearing parts of a vine, it grows up again and yields other branches, flourishing and fruitful; even so the same thing happens with us. For the vine planted by God, and Christ the Saviour, is his people."[2] "If any one ruler whatever," wrote Clement of Alexandria, "prohibit the Greek philosophy, it vanishes forthwith. But our doctrine, on its very first proclamation, was prohibited by kings and tyrants together, as well as particular rulers and governors, with all their mercenaries, and in addition by innumerable men, warring against us, and endeavoring, as far as they could, to exterminate it. But it flourishes the more. For it dies not as human doctrine dies, nor fades as a fragile gift. For no gift of

[1] 1 Apol., xiv. [2] Dial. cum Tryph., cx.

God is fragile."[1] "The oftener," wrote Tertullian, in words that have become classic, "we are mown down by you, the more in number we grow: the blood of Christians is seed. Many of your writers exhort to the courageous bearing of pain and death, as Cicero in the *Tusculans*, as Seneca in his *Chances*. And yet their words do not find so many disciples as Christians do, teachers not by words, but by their deeds. That very obstinacy you rail against is the preceptress. For who that contemplates it is not incited to inquire what is at the bottom of it? Who, after inquiry, does not embrace our doctrines?"[2]

Great stress was laid by the apologists upon the prophecies of the Old Testament, and a large space was devoted to the illustration of their wonderful fulfilment in Christianity. The evidence of miracle was also insisted upon, but received less emphasis than that of prophecy. The current belief in magic impaired the effect of an appeal to supernatural workings, and so lessened the disposition to make the appeal. The apologists, however, knew how to strip the subject of false associations. There are certain marks, Origen argued, which broadly distinguish Jesus and His works from magicians and their lying wonders. "There would, indeed, be a resemblance between them, if Jesus, like the dealers in magical arts, had performed His works only for show; but now there is not a single juggler, who, by means of his proceedings, invites his spectators to reform their manners, or trains those to the fear of God who are amazed at what they see, nor who tries to persuade them so to live as men who are to be justified by

[1] Strom., vi. 18. [2] Apol., l. Compare Ad Scapulam, v.

God. And jugglers do none of these things, because they have neither the power nor the will, nor any desire to busy themselves about the reformation of men, inasmuch as their own lives are full of the grossest and most notorious sins." Nothing could be greater than the manifest contrast between this sect of impostors and Jesus, who reformed men and instructed them still more fully by "His words and character than by His miracles."[1]

Finally, the apologists made a strong appeal to the exalted nature of Christian truth, and its adaptation to the human soul. They claimed that it presented the highest ideal of life conceivable, and was in harmony with all the nobler impulses and aspirations of man. Tertullian represents that the soul in its native, unperverted impulses is Christian, and bears witness to the main truths of Christianity. Hence, often, the heathen himself, when startled out of the force of custom, will call out the name of God like a monotheist, and look, not to the Capitol, but to Heaven.[2] Clement of Alexandria describes, in his poetic way, how the riches of God's love are poured upon man in the gospel; how Christ is a Master far excelling all that is fabled of Amphion, Arion, or Orpheus, bringing harmony into a disordered universe, and especially healing the discords in man, "this beautiful breathing instrument of music" from the hands of God.[3] "The name of Jesus," says Origen, "can still remove distractions from the minds of men, and expel demons, and also take away diseases; and produce a marvellous meekness of spirit and complete change of character, and a humanity and goodness

[1] Cont. Celsum, i. 68. [2] De Testimonio Animæ. [3] Cohort., i.

and gentleness in those individuals who do not feign themselves to be Christians for the sake of subsistence, or the supply of any mortal wants, but who have honestly accepted the doctrine concerning God and Christ, and the judgment to come."[1]

[1] Cont. Celsum, i. 67.

CHAPTER III.

HERESIES AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

I.—CLASSIFICATION OF HERESIES.

THE importance of Christianity as an historical fact is well evinced by the all-comprehending movement which it called forth. By repulsion or attraction, it affected the life and thought of the greater portion of the ancient world. Every prominent religious system from Italy to India soon felt more or less the vibrations which its entrance into the world awakened.

In the previous chapters we have traced the movement on the side of repulsion, the struggle of Christianity with an openly hostile Judaism and heathenism. We have now to consider the movement on the side of attraction, the false alliance which Judaism and heathenism sought to make with Christianity, the struggle of the Church with heresy. This struggle did not tax the Church in the same way as the former; still, the demands were formidable. To deal with the professed friends was, in important respects, more difficult than to withstand the open enemies. The former party, if not by their own choice and estimation, were in reality as much enemies as the latter. Their essential antagonism to Christianity had, also, much the same ground. A false conservatism was prominent in both cases. Ex-

treme Judaism and extreme heathenism regarded Christianity as subversive of their old established order, and declared that it ought to be destroyed root and branch. A more liberal Judaism and heathenism confessed the virtue and right of Christianity, and felt attracted toward it; but, at the same time, many within their ranks were unwilling to renounce their previous theories. They carried these over to Christianity, warped in their behalf the interpretation of Christianity; in short, remained in part, and sometimes in large part, Jews and heathens, while they assumed the name of Christians.

The early heresies, then, may in general be characterized as false attempts to blend the old of other systems with the new of Christianity. This was conspicuously the case with two of the principal classes of heresies, and may be regarded, to some extent, the case with the third. These three classes of heresies were the following: (1) the Judaistic, (2) the Gnostic and Manichæan, (3) the Monarchian, or Anti-trinitarian. Of these the Jewish and the Gnostic were largely the antipodes of each other in spirit and aim. Jewish heresy, so far as it was an outgrowth of average Pharisaism, was radically contrasted with Gnosticism. But there were speculative schools within the bounds of Judaism which harbored Gnostic elements. This was to some extent the case with the Essenes, and was especially the case with the speculative Judaism of Alexandria of which Philo was the leading representative at the beginning of the first century. We have, therefore, some heresies in which Jewish and Gnostic ingredients are commingled.

II.—THE JUDAISTIC HERESIES.

1. EBIONISM. — While Judaism was truly a forerunner of Christianity, it was in large part unwilling to accept the position of a mere forerunner. It wished to retain its place and prominence after it had performed the work of introduction. It was unwilling to adopt that true maxim of a forerunner, so nobly uttered by John the Baptist, "He must increase, but I must decrease." Hence the greater part of the nation rejected the gospel.

Of those Jews who received Christ as the Messiah, many came into full fellowship with their Gentile brethren, and claimed no superiority in virtue of the law. Others, however, continued in the spirit of those who disturbed Paul's congregations by insisting that it was necessary to keep the law of Moses. Even the destruction of the temple under Vespasian, and the complete banishment of Judaism from the precincts of Jerusalem under Hadrian, could not wean the more zealous of them from their Jewish exclusiveness. Hence, they passed from the condition of a party within the Church to the status of a sect without its borders. Near the middle of the second century we find them ranked as an heretical faction, and shortly thereafter strongly reprobated by Catholic writers under the name of Ebionites. The probable origin of this name is that suggested by Origen, who derives it from *ebion*, the Hebrew word for poor.[1] The name may have been applied at first to

[1] De Prin., iv. 1. 22; Cont. Celsum, ii. 1. Origen, however, probably gave a wrong turn to his exposition, in his intimation that the Ebionites took their name from the *poverty of the law* for which they were such

Jewish Christians generally by the Pharisees, who wished to stigmatize them as belonging to the poorer ranks. The term, having thus become associated with those of Jewish extraction, might very naturally be applied to them by Gentile Christians with reference to their Jewish type of faith.

The main body of those who were classed as Ebionites asserted the obligation of all Christians to keep the law of Moses. They rejected the apostolic office of Paul. They used only the Gospel of Matthew, and that in a mutilated form. In their view Christ was a mere man, conceived in the ordinary way, and distinguished only by his righteous walk and the superior endowment of the Spirit which came upon him at his baptism. They were also millenarians, and looked for the coming of Christ to inaugurate a visible reign at Jerusalem. But the party of Jewish dissent was not altogether homogeneous. Irenæus[1] and Hippolytus,[2] it is true, make no discrimination between different classes of Ebionites. Origen, on the other hand, speaks of the "twofold sect" of the Ebionites, specifying, as the distinction between the two sections, that the one denied, while the other accepted, the supernatural conception of Christ.[3] A century earlier Justin Martyr had intimated that the Church had to deal with two classes of Judaizers, — the one imposing the law of Moses only upon themselves,

sticklers. Eusebius, iii. 27, says that their name indicates their low and mean opinions of Christ. Tertullian, De Carne Christi, xiv., xviii., xxiv., assumes that there was a founder of the sect by the name of Ebion. This view is opposed by the silence of some writers and the counter-statements of others.

[1] Cont. Hær., i. 26. 2.

[2] Philosophumena, vii. 22.

[3] Cont. Celsum, v. 61.

the other insisting that it should be kept by all.[1] In his opinion, it was right to commune with the former class, though some, as he states, thought differently.

Near the end of the fourth century, reference appears to a Jewish party, located mainly in Syria, bearing the name of Nazarenes.[2] No definite record of their antecedents is given. The conjecture, however, lies near at hand, that they were not without historical connection with the more liberal of the Judaizers referred to by Justin Martyr, and the more orthodox of the Ebionites described by Origen.

2. The System of Cerinthus. — This errorist, educated, according to Hippolytus and Theodoret, in Egypt, was a contemporary of the Apostle John, and began to spread his views in Asia Minor during the lifetime of the apostle. He might in some respects be classed with the Gnostics. His separation of God from the world, his interposition of intermediate beings, his characterization of the world-maker as an unconscious agent of the Most High, and his distinction between Jesus and the heavenly Christ, — the former being the son of Mary and Joseph, while the latter was a superior being who was joined with Him in the interval between His baptism and His passion, — were quite in the Gnostic vein. At the same time he coincided with the stringent Judaizers in asserting the continued obligation to keep the Mosaic law, and in proclaiming a thousand years'

[1] Dial cum Tryph., xlvii.

[2] Augustine, De Bap. Cont. Donat., vii. 1. Epiphanius, Hær., xxix. Jerome, Comm. in Isaiam, Lib. x. cap. 31; De Vir. Illustr., iii.; Epist., cxii. 13. Theodoret, Hær. Fab., ii. 2.

reign of the Messiah on earth, with Jerusalem as the centre of His kingdom.[1]

3. The Pseudo-Clementine System. — Not far from the middle of the second century there appeared a work embodying a peculiar phase of Jewish speculation. This work, which is known as the Clementine Homilies, purported to give an account, by the hand of Clement of Rome, of the conversion of the author, of his experience in company with Peter, and of the apostle's sermons and disputations with Simon Magus. The work having a kindred subject-matter, and also imputed to Clement, — namely, the Recognitions, — was probably of a somewhat later origin than the Homilies. The former is the less remote from Catholic teaching. Both exhibit no little art in the combination of vivid narrative and scene-painting with the exposition of doctrinal beliefs. Besides these two writings, there is an Epitome of the Homilies.

The system contained in the Homilies cannot be imputed in its entirety to any known sect. While the materials were for the most part at hand, the peculiar combination of them which is here presented was due to an individual mind. However, some of the leading features of the system are supposed to have been entertained by the Elkesaites, an obscure sect that arose in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea. This sect took its name from one Elxai, or Elchesai, who claimed to be a

[1] See Irenæus, Cont. Hær., i. 26. 1 ; Hippolytus, Phil., vii. 21, x. 17 ; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii. 28, vii. 25; Theodoret, Hær. Fab., ii. 3; Epiphanius, Hær., xxviii.

prophet, and wrote a book for which he asserted divine inspiration.[1]

The Homilies place the Jewish emphasis upon the unity of God, but fall quite below the best Jewish thought as respects His spirituality. God, it is represented, dwells on high in bodily form, the image of which is seen in man. He is the centre of the universe; and from Him, as such, life-giving power emanates in every direction.[2] No second being or person stands in the place or bears the name of God. At the same time it is conceded that there is a species of duality in Him. He has, so to speak, His feminine side. "His wisdom was that with which He himself always rejoiced as with His own spirit. It is united as soul to God, but it is extended by Him as hand fashioning the universe."[3]

A dualistic view of the world is strongly emphasized. "God has distinguished," say the Homilies, "all principles into pairs and opposites. . . . The present world is female, as a mother bringing the souls of her children; but the world to come is male, as a father receiving his children." To every order of good there is a corresponding evil. Next to Adam, the father of the good, stands Eve, the mother of the evil; next to the righteous Abel, the unrighteous Cain; next to the pious Jacob, the profane Esau; over against the true prophets, the false; over against the true apostles, the deceiving apostles; over against the Christ, the Antichrist.

[1] Hippolytus, Philos., ix. 8–12; Euseb., vi. 38; Epiphanius, Hær., xix., xxx. 3, 17.

[2] Hom., xvi. 19; xvii. 7–10.

[3] Hom., xvi. 12; xi. 22.

Indeed, in this world evil is foremost: good holds the second place in the several pairs.[1]

The highest expression of good on earth is the prophetic spirit. This has re-appeared again and again. It operated in Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses. Jesus Christ is the last and perfect embodiment of this spirit. He is simply the ideal Prophet, the infallible Teacher. Christ is a Saviour only in virtue of being man's teacher. He saves by enlightening.[2]

The freedom of the will is asserted in sufficiently explicit terms. But the general system is too strongly tinged with dualism to be favorable to real freedom. It is even said that God determined that the present kingdom should be given to the Evil One,[3] and that this Evil One is God's left hand, an agent for accomplishing His will.[4]

In his treatment of the Old Testament, the author of the Homilies pursues a very free method, rejecting as lying interpolations every thing that does not accord with his views. He represents Peter as saying that some of the Scriptures are true and some false, and that one must distinguish between them as a good money-changer distinguishes between coins.[5] He idealizes the character of Adam and the patriarchs, and denies the

[1] Hom., ii. 15–17, 33; iii. 22–27; xx. 2. Compare Recognitions, iii. 59, 61.

[2] Hom., ii. 6, 10, 12; iii. 11–20; xviii. 13, 14. The teaching function receives similar emphasis in the Recognitions. "All evil," it is said, "springs from ignorance" (v. 4).

[3] Hom., xx. 2.

[4] Hom., xx. 3.

[5] Hom., ii. 38, 51; iii. 42, 50; xviii. 19, 20.

sins imputed to them.[1] Sacrifices are discarded,[2] and circumcision is not inculcated. Still, Christianity is essentially identified with Judaism; and it is stated that one may be equally approved, whether he follows the guidance of Moses or of Jesus.[3]

The ecclesiastical stand-point of the work is hierarchical. Great importance is attached to baptism and episcopacy. But James rather than Peter is represented as the head of the hierarchy, the highest authority in the Church. "Remember," Peter is made to say, "to shun apostle or teacher or prophet who does not first accurately compare his preaching with that of James, who was called the brother of my Lord, and to whom was intrusted to administer the Church of the Hebrews in Jerusalem."[4] Paul is unmentioned, and in a few instances there is reason to suspect that a side thrust was aimed at him.[5] But the brunt of the author's polemic was not so much against the teaching of Paul as against the anti-Judaic Gnosticism of Marcion.

III.—GNOSTICISM.

1. Originating Causes of Gnosticism.—Three causes were especially operative in giving rise to Gnosticism. The first of these was that spirit of intellectual aristocracy which dominated so largely the ancient world. Priesthoods and philosophers embraced the theory that the great mass of men were without capacity for the higher grades of religious as well as of

[1] Hom., iii. 20, 21. [2] Hom., iii. 45. [3] Hom., viii. 6, 7.
[4] Hom., xi. 35. Compare Recognitions, iv. 35.
[5] Perhaps this is the case in Hom. xvii. 19.

secular knowledge. The favored few, as a kind of spiritual aristocracy, were set over against the many. Platonism was not free from this spirit; indeed, it ministered directly to pride of intellect, by making ignorance or mental infatuation the source of sin, and consequently locating salvation in the healing and cultivation of the understanding. For the simple-minded it held out but little hope of reaching God, since it considered elevated philosophical reflection as pre-eminently the pathway to His presence. Now, this inveterate tendency of ancient thought still held its place in many minds that were attracted toward Christianity. They were not willing to rank with the common mass, and form a part of a spiritual democracy. Ordinary Christians were regarded by them as merely men of faith who had received on authority the outward facts of Christianity, but had not been inducted into its mysteries. From this unlearned multitude they wished to be distinguished as the men of knowledge, as the Gnostics, who had grasped Christianity in its transcendent significance. Their tendency was to sacrifice the historical and the ethical to the speculative and the intellectual. "The motto of the Gnostic," says Mansel, "might be exactly given in the words of a distinguished modern philosopher, 'Men are saved, not by the historical, but by the metaphysical.'"[1] "The tendency of Gnosticism," says Pressensé, "is always to make the element of knowledge predominate over that of the moral life: it changes religion into theosophy."[2] It is

[1] The Gnostic Heresies, p. 11. The words of Fichte are, "Nur das Metaphysische, keineswegs aber das Historische, macht selig."

[2] Heresy and Christian Doctrine, Book I., chap. i.

not, however, to be inferred from this, that Gnosticism, as a whole, was actually distinguished by a high intellectuality. A large part of it was not so much a product of genuine thought as of a wild and rampant imagination. To explain how they came into possession of their boasted knowledge, and to obtain a sanction for the same, the Gnostics were forward to claim that Christ had revealed to a select circle what He never had declared openly, and that this secret teaching had been transmitted continuously through a line of disciples, whose natures rendered them receptive of the mystery.

A second factor which contributed greatly to Gnosticism was the spirit of Oriental mysticism. As is abundantly attested by history, the Oriental mind has a peculiar bent toward the allegorical, the mystical, the vague, and the immense. By a mind thus disposed, clear outlines and divine simplicity were poorly appreciated. Jewish history, and even the gospel history, appeared too narrow and commonplace. It was thought necessary, therefore, to penetrate beyond the range of revelation, to traverse the secret chambers of the universe, and to view the facts of the gospel in the light of developments which had taken place within the Godhead, and among the higher powers.

A third motive-power in the direction of Gnosticism was a lively feeling of dualism, a painful consciousness of the might of the evil which struggles in this world for mastery over the good. This feeling characterized to a peculiar degree the declining classic world. The state of society emphasized the force of downward tendencies, and the inherited faith afforded meagre promise of a remedy. There was accordingly little of youthful ambition

and hope to make present evil seem less by summoning up exciting prospects of coming good. A sense of the evil in the world rested like a heavy weight upon many heathen minds that were not too indifferent, or too absorbed in earthliness and sin, to reflect upon the subject. This feeling, when carried into the speculative sphere, and not corrected by an appropriation of the inner spirit of Christianity, logically issued in a species of philosophical pessimism, in other words, it naturally gave currency to that dark view of the world already naturalized in the Orient, according to which evil has the force of a necessity, and is an inherent quality of material existence.

2. Materials employed by Gnosticism.—Eclecticism was carried to an extreme by Gnosticism. Some ideas, particularly that of redemption, were borrowed from Christianity; some from the more speculative forms of Judaism, especially the Philonic; some from the varied schools of Greek philosophy; some from the varied religions of the Orient, including Zoroastrianism, and probably also Buddhism and Brahmanism. Whether borrowed or not from these last sources, some of the Gnostic ideas were undoubtedly such as are found in the Hindu pantheism; and there is little reason to question that they had an historical connection more or less direct with that source. The conquests of Alexander resulted in a measure of communication with India. Buddhist missionaries are supposed to have visited Egypt before the Christian era.[1] That the religious philosophy of India

[1] C. W. King, The Gnostics and their Remains (p. 23). Neander and Baur also emphasize the influence of the Indian speculations.

was widely celebrated in the early centuries, we know from the remarks of Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen.[1] Thus every quarter was laid under contribution, and made to supply one or more fragments for the fantastic combinations of the Gnostic kaleidoscope.

3. Features generally found in the Gnostic Systems. — The Gnostic systems agreed, in the main, upon the following points: God is the unfathomable abyss exalted above all contact with the creature world. The universe is divided into many stories; and the Supreme Being (as Tertullian ironically represents in his treatise against the Valentinians) "has His dwelling in the attics."[2] From God an unfoldment has proceeded, His attributes or powers going forth in personal form, the first emanations serving as sources for those more remote, until a chain of celestial beings, or Æons, appears between the Supreme Father and the material realm. The material is the seat of evil, something essentially opposed to the divine. The fashioner of the material world, the Jehovah of the Old Testament, is a subordinate being, standing below even the Æons, and representing psychical rather than spiritual existence. The Saviour is a being from the Æonic world, who united himself with Jesus of Nazareth. By this union, however, which was only temporary, he was not brought into contact with matter, or subjected to bodily needs and sufferings. The incarnation was unreal. Men are by nature divided into different moral classes, and so

[1] Apol., xlii.; Strom., vi. 4; Cont. Celsum, i. 24.
[2] Adv. Valentin., vii.

fitted for different destinies. No member of a lower class can transcend the circle which fate, or an absolute predestination, has drawn about him.

It is also a common feature of the Gnostic systems, that they deal in images rather than in pure conceptions. Every thing assumes shape or personality. As Irenæus complains, the Gnostics were "perverse mythologists."[1] Theology, under their handling, becomes not so much a discourse about God, as an imaginary history of God, a grand romance, tracing divine life in its outgoings toward the material world, and in the return toward its original source.

4. Points of Difference. — The Gnostic systems differed as to the degree of dualism which they affirmed. The Syrian were in general more dualistic than the Alexandrian. Some, much after the fashion of the Hindu pantheists, regarded the material realm as the region of emptiness and illusion, the void opposite of the *pleroma*, that world of reality and spiritual fulness; others assigned a more positive nature to the material, and regarded it as capable of an evil aggressiveness, even apart from any quickening by the incoming of life from above. Some sects were less hostile to Old-Testament Judaism than others. Hence, while some represented Jehovah as a positively malicious being, others represented him as merely a limited being unconsciously fulfilling the will of a higher power. So marked were the differences in this respect, that Neander considers the attitude toward Judaism the proper standard of classification. Some taught a stricter docetism,

[1] Cont. Hær., iv. 1. 1.

or more thorough negation of all reality in Christ's bodily appearance, than did others. In their use of the Scriptures, all the Gnostics were arbitrary to the last degree; but some were disposed to sustain their views chiefly by far-fetched allegorizing, while others rejected outright large portions of the Bible, and worked over the remaining to suit their ideas. In their practical principles there were also notable differences. Some tolerated marriage; others reprobated it in the strongest terms. Contempt for the world led some to strict asceticism; others pleaded the same thing for unbounded license. Some practised great simplicity in their worship; others indulged an extreme of mystic pomp.

5. Organization, Era, and Influence. — With the Gnostics, the speculative predominated over the practical. The speculative, too, exhibited much of centrifugal energy. Disciples were little disposed to adhere closely to their masters. Hence Gnosticism, on the whole, was not an example of compact organization and vigorous propagandism. It resulted in a multitude of separate, shifting schools. Tertullian's description, though likely overdrawn, may be credited with no little truth. "All heresies," says he, "when thoroughly looked into, are detected harboring dissent in many particulars even from their founders. The majority of them have not even churches. Motherless, houseless, creedless, outcasts, they wander about in their own essential worthlessness."[1] Many of the Gnostics, could they have found tolerance, would have preferred

[1] De Præscript. Hæret., xlii.

to remain in the communion of the Catholic Church, constituting there a species of spiritual and intellectual aristocracy.

Gnosticism arose, and made a noticeable advance, during the lifetime of the apostles. The early Fathers attached to Simon the magician, whom Peter withstood in Samaria, the opprobrium of being the first Gnostic. Quite a number of passages which probably refer to Gnostic heresy are found in the New Testament (Col. ii. 8, 18; 1 Tim. 1, 4, vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 16–18; Jude 17–19; Rev. ii. 6, 14; 1 John i. 1–3, iv. 1–3; 2 John, 7). As Irenæus testifies, and as the contents of the book also indicate, John wrote portions of his Gospel with direct reference to the Gnostic vagaries of Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans.[1] But it was the second century which was the special era of Gnosticism. In this century arose the most elaborate and influential systems. At the beginning of the third century, Gnosticism had already, in large part, succumbed before the able and vigorous opposition of the Church. Like great epidemics, it had its season, and appeared thereafter only in limited strength.

While Gnosticism was not destitute of valuable thoughts, and contained some elements of speculative acuteness, it was, on the whole, a caricature of Christianity. Nevertheless, it was not without its benefits. On the one hand, the work of opposing it brought the essential truths of Christianity more clearly into the consciousness of the early Church than would have been possible otherwise. On the other hand, Gnosticism made a positive contribution by calling attention

[1] Cont. Haer., iii. 11.

to Christianity as a central factor in the scheme of the universe. Herein it did service as an off-set to the narrow-minded Ebionism.

6. Glance at Various Systems. — The earliest of the important exponents of the Egyptian Gnosis was Basilides. Valentinus, who wrote some years later, was its most distinguished representative. Indeed, his system may be regarded as the most elaborate and finished expression of the more speculative type of Gnosticism. Saturninus was a leading exponent of the Syrian Gnosis. Marcion was the most successful propagator of Gnosticism that came from Asia Minor. The teachings of these four men, as being most representative and significant, will command our chief attention; but, before they are taken up, a brief reference to some of the less noteworthy of the Gnostic systems may be worth our consideration.

According to Irenæus and Hippolytus, Simon Magus, whom Peter encountered in Samaria, represented himself as a manifestation of divinity, — the active principle or father of the universe. The passive or feminine principle, he claimed, was embodied in his companion Helena, whom he had purchased from slavery in Tyre. This Helena, the first conception of his mind, after having become the mother of the powers which made the world, suffered degradation at their hands, but at length had been restored by him. Menander, the disciple and successor of Simon, gave currency to similar views. The Simonians, who worshipped the sorcerer as a redeeming being, are said to have been of a highly immoral stamp. Origen testified that in his day the

sect probably did not number thirty members in the whole world.[1]

Irenæus identifies the Nicolaitans of later times with those mentioned under that name in the Apocalypse, and derives their name from Nicolas, one of the seven deacons, whom he supposes to have apostatized from the faith.[2] Clement of Alexandria, on the other hand, while he indicates that the sect claimed descent from the deacon, discredits the propriety of the claim.[3] The sect had a reputation for gross antinomianism. Clement charges them with a shameful perversion of the maxim that the flesh must be abused.

The Ophites, or Naassenes, are so called from the prominence given to the serpent in their system. As exhibiting the same feature, the Peratae, Sethians, and Cainites are properly ranked as branches of the same general class. The eclectic system of these Ophite sects began early to be formed, possibly before the rise of Christianity, from which it received only a moderate contribution. The significance attached to the serpent seems to have been different in the different branches; some understanding by the serpent an offspring of the evil Demiurge, others Sophia, others the Word or the Divine Son.[4] Some of the Ophites were antinomians of the extremest cast. The Cainites, who were one of the most fanatical of these sects, looked upon the God of the Old Testament as an evil being, gloried in the disobedience of the first parents, and honored as worthy heroes such men as Cain, Korah, and Judas Iscariot.[5]

[1] Cont. Celsum, i. 57. [2] Cont. Hær., i. 26. 3. [3] Strom., ii. 20.
[4] Irenæus, Cont. Hær., i. 30; Hippolytus, Philos., v. 1-17.
[5] Irenæus, i. 31.

Their hostility to the God of law became a raving mania. Origen speaks of the Ophites as "a very insignificant sect."[1]

The Carpocratians, emanating from Carpocrates and his son Epiphanes, formed another of those sects, so predominantly heathen as to exhibit but little trace of the influence of Christianity. They cultivated a hero-worship much in the spirit of Neo-Platonism, and placed Christ in the same rank with other men of religious fame. They were antinomian, teaching that license is a fitting expression of contempt for all external restrictions, and a stepping-stone to true emancipation.[2]

The Encratites proceeded from Tatian, who was converted to Christianity by Justin Martyr, but afterwards strayed into Gnosticism. His teaching concerning the Æons resembled that of Valentinus. Like Marcion, he discountenanced marriage, and enjoined a rigid asceticism.[3]

7. The System of Basilides. — The writings of Hippolytus[4] and Clement of Alexandria are regarded as the most reliable sources of information upon this system. Basilides taught at Alexandria in the time of Hadrian. The starting-point of his system is the extreme of Gnostic vagueness. He goes beyond all bounds in emphasizing the transcendence of the primal Being, declaring Him not only above all name and conception, but above the category of existence itself, identical to

[1] Cont. Celsum, vi. 24.

[2] Irenæus, i. 25; Hippolytus, vii. 20; Euseb., iv. 7. In point of antinomianism, the Antitactæ and Prodicians are associated with the Carpocratians.

[3] Irenæus, i. 28. [4] Philos., vii. 2–15.

our thought with non-entity. In passing from the primal Being to the lower orders of existence, Basilides takes a somewhat unusual course for a Gnostic. Discarding the emanation theory, or a downward evolution, he predicates instantaneous creation and evolution upwards. First of all, the unnamable Being produces by an involuntary fiat the world-seed. In this seed, which contains the universe in germ, there exists a threefold sonship of the same substance as its Author. One part or order of the sonship is refined, one part relatively gross, while the third is in need of purification. The first of these rises at once to the supreme Deity; the second, by the aid of the Holy Spirit as a wing, rises to the next inferior place; while the disengaged wing remains between it and the lower region. From the seed springs up now the Great Ruler, who ascends to the firmament, or the region of the Holy Spirit. An inferior Ruler also, the Lawgiver of the Old Testament, springs up and governs an inferior space. Under these Rulers, an elaborate scheme of creation is inaugurated. The Great Ruler, otherwise called Abrasax, or Abraxas, is said to preside over no less than three hundred and sixty-five heavens. Meanwhile, each of the Rulers had generated a son greater than himself. These sons of the Rulers serve a redemptive purpose, enlightening their fathers, and providing a channel by which enlightenment descends to the sonship needing purification; Jesus of Nazareth being the first recipient, and illustrating by his ascent to the higher regions the exaltation awaiting his followers.

The system of Basilides, while of course it disparages Judaism, reveals no special bitterness towards the same.

In this it agrees with that which is next to be characterized.

8. The System of Valentinus. — This most distinguished of the Gnostic writers, who mingled not a little of the poetical with the speculative, is supposed to have been a native of Egypt, and of Jewish descent. He taught in Rome the major part of the interval between 140 and 160, and ended his career at the latter date in Cyprus. According to Tertullian, he was an able and eloquent man, who was much disappointed by his failure to obtain the office of a bishop.[1]

The system of Valentinus starts forth with the assumption of God as the primordial abyss, the absolute ground of all real existence. As to whether He dwelt alone before the first of the Æons was generated, there was a difference of opinion among the Valentinians themselves. "Some of them," says Hippolytus, "suppose that the Father is unfeminine, unwedded, and solitary. But others reckon along with the Father of the universe, in order that He may be a Father, Sige as a spouse."[2] Probably the first of these representations was that offered by Valentinus himself. From the supreme Father, as the first link in the chain of emanations, is projected the pair Nous and Aletheia. From this pair proceeds the pair Logos and Zoe, and from this last emanates the pair Anthropos and Ecclesia. Then ten emanations proceed from the first two Æons. Logos and Zoe, serving also as a ground of emanations, add twelve Æons, making twenty-eight in all. These

[1] Adv. Valentin., iv.
[2] Philos., vi. 24. Compare Irenæus, Cont. Hær., i. 1.

together constitute the *pleroma*, the region of light and spiritual fulness. The perfect harmony within this region is first broken by the ambition of Sophia, the remotest of the Æons, who is seized with a passion to search into the nature of the supreme Father, and to emulate Him also by producing without her partner. It is, however, only a formless, incomplete being that she is able to bring forth, a being unfit for the *pleroma*. To meet the exigency thus created, another pair of Æons, namely, Christ and the Holy Spirit, is produced. The shapeless Achamoth, the offspring of Sophia's passions, is expelled from the *pleroma*, receiving form, however, through the good offices of Christ and the Holy Spirit; and the Father produces an additional Æon, Horos, to guard the border. Pity for the fallen Achamoth now causes the Æons to combine for the production of the Æon Saviour, who is to serve as the agent of her redemption. He descends with his angels into the void and formless region, where the daughter of Sophia is tortured with desire, fear, grief, and perplexity, and separates her passions from her. Various orders of beings result. From the passions of Achamoth come the Devil and his angels, and every thing of a material nature; from her tears, liquid substance; from her laughter, whatever is bright in nature. Her repentance and desires result in psychical natures, at the head of which is the Demiurge, or world-fashioner. Her joyful gaze upon the beauty of the Saviour's attendants gives rise to pneumatic, or spiritual, natures. Having thus begun the redemption of Achamoth, the Saviour retires for a season.

The Demiurge, to whom the details of the lower creation are intrusted, and who unconsciously is the

instrument of a higher power, is the God of the Old Testament. In forming men, the Demiurge has power to impart to them only material and psychical elements; but, without his knowledge, Achamoth secures that a certain select portion of mankind should become partakers of the spiritual essence. Corresponding to the three varieties of substance, there are three orders of men, — the earthly (or somatic or hylic), the psychical, and the spiritual; the immediate sovereign of the first being Satan, of the second the Demiurge, of the third Achamoth.

The consummation of redemption is in the following manner: The Demiurge promises the coming of a Messiah. This promised Messiah appears in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, a being made in the image of the Demiurge, and having the bodily form of a man; his body, however, being composed not of matter, but of an ethereal substance from the upper regions. At the baptism of this Messiah, there is joined with him the Saviour from the *pleroma*, who continues with him till his passion. In virtue of the redemptive work, men receive a revelation of the truth suited to their natures, and are attracted toward their proper sphere. The lost sheep, Achamoth, is finally to be restored to the *pleroma* as the bride of the Saviour. The spiritual men are to be received into their presence, and to be united to the attendant angels. Psychical men, if they improve their opportunity, are to find a happy, though less exalted, lot in the paradise of the Demiurge.[1] Material

[1] An element of contingency is admitted only in respect to the second class. Men of the first class are certain to be saved; those of the third certain to be destroyed, those of the second are saved or destroyed, according as they elect good or evil.

men, and all things material, are to be consumed by fire.

In its outcome, therefore, the theory of Valentinus stops short of the true pantheistic goal. But this issue is to be regarded as rather the product of a happy inconsistency than of strict adherence to the requirements of his premises. "As the thought," says Mansel, "which underlies his whole theory is substantially that of the Indian pantheism, according to which all finite existence is an error and an unreality, so his scheme of redemption logically carried out should have resulted in the absorption of all finite and relative existence into the bosom of the infinite and absolute."[1]

The school of Valentinus won many adherents. Among the more distinguished disciples were Ptolemy, Marcus, and Heracleon. The name of Bardesanes might also be included, but he is supposed to have adhered only temporarily to the teachings of Valentinus.

9. The System of Saturninus. — Only brief accounts of this system are given us. It is chiefly noteworthy for the impress of Persian dualism which it reveals. A region of light and a region of darkness are set over against each other. On the borders of the former stand seven angels, the God of the Jews being their chief. In the exercise of their creative function, they produce the earth and man. This is interpreted by the powers of darkness, under the lead of Satan, as an assault against their realm; and a continual warfare results. Men are allied with the one party or the other, according to their possession or destitution of the princi-

[1] The Gnostic Heresies, Lecture 12.

ple of light. To assist those who are worthy, the supreme Deity sends down a redeeming being, who takes on the semblance of a body, and becomes the teacher and guide of spiritual men. Asceticism is the path to emancipation. The followers of Saturninus are said to have reprobated marriage and procreation as being from Satan, and to have abstained for the most part from animal food.

10. The System of Marcion. — Marcion, reputed to have been the son of a bishop in Pontus, was born in the early part of the second century. On account, probably, of his restless temper and leaning to heresy, he was expelled from the church of his native place. Coming to Rome, he met the Gnostic Cerdo, and adopted a Gnostic type of doctrine.

A somewhat exceptional position among the Gnostics was occupied by Marcion. He had much more of a practical disposition than the great majority. This manifested itself in greater activity in spreading his views, in less emphasis upon the gnosis as compared with faith, and in a comparative rejection of allegorizing interpretations of Scripture. In his way, however, he was as arbitrary as any of the Gnostics in his treatment of the oracles of religion. He denied all doctrinal authority to the Old Testament. Of the New Testament, he used a mutilated copy of Luke's Gospel and ten Epistles of Paul. Among the apostles, Paul was his sole authority, the others being only *pseudo*-apostles and falsifiers of the truth.

It was a fundamental assumption of Marcion, that Christianity, on its appearance in the world, was an

entirely new fact; and this idea colored all his thinking. He was probably a man of warm, enthusiastic nature. We read how, in the zeal of his first love, he gave largely of his possessions to the Church.[1] His conversion was by a sudden crisis. In like manner, it seemed to him that Christianity had suddenly broken into the world. He saw no preparation for it in Judaism or in heathenism. The chasm between the Old Testament and the New seemed to him immeasurable, so that by no possibility could both have come from the same God. The New Testament shows us the God of love; the Old reveals to us a Being who is angry, who punishes, whose one idea is justice.

Marcion, therefore, regarded Jehovah as a middle being, intermediate between the Supreme God and the material world, the Demiurge, who falsely imagined himself to be supreme. Matter he regarded as unoriginated, something essentially evil, the realm of Satan. As he gives no account of the origin of Jehovah, it would seem that he predicated the existence of three primary unoriginated principles.

Men were made by the Demiurge in his own image. But, as they were given bodies from the evil matter, they proved corrupt and unmanageable subjects. Unable by other means to lead them to their proper goal, the Demiurge designed the sending of a Messiah, and the coming of such was predicted by his prophets. Meanwhile, the Supreme Being sent into the world His own Christ, who, however, was not born of Mary, but came down from heaven in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius.[2] The Demiurge mistook him for the

[1] Tertullian, Adv. Marcionem, iv. 4. [2] Adv. Marc., iv. 7.

promised Messiah; but, when he found that he was not acting as an instrument of his will, he secured his death through the Jews. Then Christ appeared to him in his true character, and brought him to the consciousness that there was a God above himself. As regards the incarnation, Marcion was an absolute docetist, teaching that the bodily appearance of Christ was pure delusion, and that he never came into contact with sinful matter. His hatred of matter, in connection with his moral earnestness, naturally led him to inculcate asceticism, and to repudiate marriage. A rejection of a bodily resurrection followed, as a matter of course, from his principles, as from those of the Gnostics generally.

Tertullian says of Marcion, that he repented of his error, and was anticipating restoration to the Catholic Church when his death intervened. But abhorrence of heresy was so easily productive of unreliable traditions, that we hardly know how much credit to give to this statement. Of the feeling of repulsion which Marcion's system awakened in the orthodox, we have an example in the story of his meeting with Polycarp. As Marcion saw the venerable bishop in Rome, he came to him and accosted him with the words, "Do you not know me?" —"Yes," replied Polycarp, "I know the firstborn of the devil."[1]

The Marcionites, who were honorably distinguished among the Gnostics by purity of morals, spread into many regions. Traces of them appear at intervals for several centuries.

In describing the various Gnostic systems, we have made no special effort to go back of their mythological

[1] Irenæus, Cont. Hær., iii. 3. 4.

guise, and to extract a definite philosophical import. Such a task is at once difficult and hazardous. Theosophic speculation does not easily admit of translation. Very likely, when stripped of their peculiar imagery, some of the Gnostic representations would not appear very widely distinguished from more recent attempts to solve great problems, such as the passage from the absolute to the relative, from unity to plurality, from good to evil. But, on the other hand, the interpreter needs to be careful not to impute to the Gnostics too great exactness and rigor of thought. On the whole, they moved more in the realm of imagination than of logic.

IV. — MANICHÆISM.

Like Gnosticism, Manichæism was a mixture of heathenism with Christianity. It differed from average Gnosticism by its smaller appropriation of Christian ideas, its more radical and undisguised naturalism, and its more thorough organization.

According to the Oriental account,[1] which is regarded more trustworthy than the Greek,[2] Mani, called also Manes or Manichæus, the founder of the Manichæan sect, was a learned Persian. He is said to have been converted to Christianity, and even to have served as a presbyter. At this time there was a special effort to restore the pure Zoroastrian faith, and much discussion as to what articles were to be included in that faith, as well as an increase of hostility to Christianity. In

[1] The outcome of recent examinations of Oriental sources may be seen in Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography.

[2] Found in Acta Archelai, li.-liv.

the midst of the agitation, Mani conceived the idea of forming an eclectic system in which Christianity and Zoroastrianism should be combined. Some have supposed that Buddhism was included as a third factor.[1] Certain it is that the system of Mani embraced elements not to be found either in pure Christianity or in pure Zoroastrianism. It is credible, moreover, as tradition reports that Mani visited India. Still, in an age when all sorts of religious and speculative elements were so widely scattered, an age which had shortly before produced the variegated forms of Gnosticism, the direct borrowing from Buddhistic sources, though not improbable, is scarcely a necessary assumption.

Giving himself out as the promised Paraclete, — that is, a divinely enlightened teacher and reformer,[2] — Mani began to spread his views not far from the middle of the third century. A brief interval of successful propagandism was cut short by persecution. Again, a favorable opportunity was found under the patronage of a friendly king, and converts were being won, when a change of rulers prepared for another change of fortune. Assailed by the ill-will of the king and the hatred of the Magi, Mani was brought to a tragic end. According to one account, he was sentenced to be flayed and hung before the gate of the city.[3]

The system of Mani starts from the assumption of an absolute dualism. Over against the world of light lies an unoriginated world of darkness, matter, fire which

[1] So decisively Neander, Kirchengeschichte, vol ii.; and Baur, Das Manichäische Religions-system.

[2] Augustine, Cont. Epist. Manich., vi.-viii.; Cont. Faustum, xiii. 4, xxxii. 18 ; Acta Archelai, xiii.

[3] Acta Arch., lv.

has no power of illumination. At the head of the former stands the good Deity with his angels, who are emanations from himself and channels of his light. In the realm of darkness work wild, ungoverned powers.[1] At first the two realms are entirely distinct; but at length the powers of darkness, in their raging tumult and strife, approach so near the upper space that they behold a glimmer of its light. Irrepressibly attracted by the unwonted vision, they press toward the light with storm-like confusion and energy; so that the good Deity finds it expedient to send forth the Son of the Mother of Life, the Primal Man, for the defence of the realm. Beset by the powers of darkness, who rush upon him with insatiate desire, the Primal Man is in danger of overthrow, and escapes only through the good offices of the Living Spirit sent to his rescue. As it is, he leaves behind a portion of the essence of light which pertained to him. The Living Spirit, who performs a sort of demiurgical function, raises that part of the luminous essence which is unaffected by contact with matter to the sun and moon. But a portion is left behind imprisoned in matter, to which it is related as

[1] Mani is represented as saying: "In one direction on the border of this bright and holy region, there was a land of darkness, deep and vast in extent, where abode fiery bodies, destructive races. Here was boundless darkness, flowing from the same source in immeasurable abundance, with the productions properly belonging to it. Beyond this were muddy, turbid waters, with their inhabitants; and inside of them, winds terrible and violent, with their prince and progenitors. Then again a fiery region of destructions, with its chiefs and peoples; and similarly inside of this, a race full of smoke and gloom, where abode the dreadful prince and chief of all, having around him innumerable princes, himself the mind and source of them all. Such are the five natures of the region of corruption." (AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Epist. Manich.*, XV.)

a soul. Thus the organism of nature is constituted.[1] Throughout the world on all sides there is more or less of the imprisoned light, or soul. This may be viewed as the suffering Son of man, *Jesus Patibilis*. The crucifixion is in a sense a continuous event. "The earth," says the Manichæan Faustus, "conceives and brings forth the mortal Jesus, who, as hanging from every tree, is the life and salvation of men."[2] "By your profane fancies," says Augustine to his former co-religionists, "Christ is not only mingled with heaven and all the stars, but conjoined and compounded with the earth and all its productions."[3]

Man, in the system of Mani, is a section of the mingled realm, his soul a portion of the world-soul, his body a portion of the evil matter. His origin was due to the powers of darkness. These minions of the evil kingdom, fearing lest the light which they had captured should be drawn off by the attractive power of the sun and the moon, incased it in a human body. Thus concentrated, the heavenly essence is made conscious of its higher origin, and the new-created man appears likely to escape the dominion of the evil powers. To prevent this, they tempt his fleshly appetites, so multiplying the race, and by partition of the essence weakening in the individual the consciousness of his higher nature.

Redemption is the release of the luminous essence from the bands of dark matter. The Redeemer is the

[1] We have given here the most concrete representation of the manner in which the two realms became intermingled, as it appears in the anti-Manichæan writings of Augustine and in the Acts of the Disputation of Archelaus with Manes. Alexander of Lycopolis used less concrete terms in his description.

[2] Augustine, Cont. Faustum, xx. 2. [3] Ibid., ii. 5.

Son of the Primal Man, the Christ, the sun spirit fantastically represented as dwelling in the sun by his power, and in the moon by his wisdom.[1] Coming down to earth in bodily form, but with only the phantom of a body, he instructs men how to attain their true destiny. Ascetic living is the sum and substance of his commands. By this means the soul is fitted for restoration to its kindred light, and, indeed, may assist to freedom some of the light imprisoned in nature. The man of exemplary continence, who observes the threefold seal of the mouth, the hands, and the breast,[2] when he partakes of the fruits of the earth sets free a portion of the captive light. Death, as the Manichæans conceived, is the liberator of the spiritual part of the believer, which passes on board the great light-ships in the heavens, the waxing of the moon being visible evidence of the cargo received.[3]

For the government of the sect, a standing college of twelve apostles, at the head of which was a president who was to be regarded as the representative of the founder, was instituted. Under this body stood seventy-two bishops, and under these, presbyters, deacons,

[1] Augustine, Cont. Faustum, xx. 2.

[2] *Signaculum oris,* abstinence from animal food and strong drink; *signaculum manuum,* renunciation of property and secular pursuits; *signaculum sinus,* renunciation of marriage, and abstinence from sensual gratification.

[3] Acta Archelai, viii.; Alexander of Lycopolis, iv. The former gives the curious representation that the Son who was sent for the salvation of souls "constructed an instrument with twelve urns (signs of the zodiac), which is made to revolve by the sphere, and draws up with it the souls of the dying. And the greater luminary receives these souls, and purifies them with its rays, and then passes them on to the moon; and in this manner the moon's disk is filled up."

and evangelists. The whole sect was divided into two classes, — the *elect* and the *hearers*. The elect held the rank of a priestly caste. They were bound to a strict asceticism, avoided marriage, renounced all private property, abstained from animal food, and took no part in preparing vegetable food lest they should be guilty of wounding that life which is held in the bonds of matter. The labors of the hearers, who were under obligation to render them great reverence, served for their support. The hearers led a less ascetic life, and were not inducted into the inner mysteries of the faith.

The Manichæan sect spread from Persia into Western Asia, North Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Though persecuted by Diocletian, and afterwards by Christian emperors, it found some adherents as late as the sixth century, and certain of its ideas came forth under new names at a still later date. Among Christian writers, Augustine produced the most distinguished refutation, being all the better prepared for his task by his nine years' experience as a Manichæan.[1]

V. — MONARCHIANISM.

As the difficult problem of reconciling the doctrine of the trinity with the divine unity began to be seriously canvassed in the Church, some took the short road over the difficulty by denying the existence of any real trinity in the Godhead. Hence a new contro-

[1] The Acts of Archelaus, and the treatise of Alexander of Lycopolis, are also of the nature of refutations of Manichæism. The subject is treated at considerable length by Epiphanius, Hær., lxvi., and by Titus of Bostra, Libri Tres Adv. Manichæos.

versy was prepared; and close upon the task of refuting the Gnostics, followed that of refuting the Monarchians, or Anti-trinitarians.

This form of heresy first elicited attention in the closing part of the second century. It does not appear to have spread very widely. We read of its disciples becoming conspicuous only in a few places. That it appeared at the same time in two different and contradictory forms, may also be taken as evidence that it was quite outside the regular current of thought in the Church, a speculative attempt to get over the difficulties of beliefs commonly accepted.

The two forms of Monarchianism agreed in teaching that God is uni-personal; in other words, they affirmed that there is only one Divine Person. The radical difference between the two was that one denied that the uni-personal God was personally incarnated in Jesus Christ, while the other affirmed that He was so incarnated. In the view of the one class, the Saviour who appeared among men was a man endowed with a peculiar fulness of the Holy Spirit; in the view of the other, He was God manifest in the flesh. According to the latter, there is no numerical distinction between Father and Son, the Son being the Father viewed under the aspect of the flesh. As their doctrine seemed to involve the conclusion that the Father was crucified, they acquired the name of Patripassians.

The first class, which differed from the Ebionites by allowing an extraordinary indwelling of the Spirit in Christ from His birth, included several groups. The Alogi are sometimes reckoned as representatives of this class, but the ground for this assignment is none too

certain. It is only known that they were opponents of the Logos teaching of John, and rejected his Gospel, as also the Apocalypse. Two or three decades after their appearance, came the schools of Theodotus and Artemon at Rome, both of whom were excommunicated by the Roman bishop not far from the year 200.[1] Finally, as the culmination of this class, came Paul of Samosata, and his followers at Antioch. The second class, which found more sympathy in the Church than the first, had in Praxeas its first prominent representative. Praxeas taught in Rome in the last part of the second century. Noëtus of Smyrna followed with similar views, which his disciples imported to Rome. According to Hippolytus, the Roman Bishop Callistus was deeply implicated in the heresy of Noëtus, into which also he had previously seduced his weak predecessor, Zephyrinus.[2] Then came the teachings of Sabellius, as the culminating product of this class of Monarchians. Beryllus of Bostra, who was converted from his theories by Origen, has been placed by some in the first class, by others in the second. The data for a decision are very scanty.[3] Neander places Beryllus among those who confessed the Divine nature of Christ. As Paul of Samosata, and Sabellius were the most significant representatives of their respective classes, we may most fitly select them for special consideration.

Paul of Samosata became Bishop of Antioch in 260. Ere long he fell under suspicion of entertaining heretical views on the nature of Christ. His plan seems to

[1] Euseb., Hist. Eccl., v. 28; Epiphanius, Hær., liv.; Theodoret, Hær. Fab., ii. 8; Hippolytus, Philos., vii. 23.

[2] Philos., ix. 6, 7; x. 23. [3] Euseb., vi. 33.

have been by cautious and gradual methods to induct the Church, over which he presided, into his own way of thinking. One expedient adopted was a remodelling of the hymns, so as to make them suit his own theology. In 269 a council of bishops pronounced his deposition; but on account of the patronage which he received from Zenobia, queen of the temporary kingdom of Palmyra, the decree could not be carried into execution till 272. In character, if the unanimous representations of early writers can be trusted, Paul was a man of vain, worldly, diplomatic turn, who loved the incense of flattery and the patronage of power. The main points of his teaching were the following: There are no personal distinctions in the Godhead. The Word and the Spirit simply denote God under different aspects, are to God what man's reason and spirit are to him. Christ had no existence prior to His earthly conception and birth. God was to some extent in Christ, but not as any factor of His person; He was in Christ only in the sense of giving to Him a superior endowment of wisdom and power. In virtue of this endowment, and the high mission with which He was intrusted, Christ attained to a species of divine dignity. Thus Paul, like the Socinians of later times, reversed the Scriptural representation that God descended to the estate of man, and taught that Christ from man became God, not indeed in essence, but in relative position and dignity.[1]

Sabellius, the most able and ingenious in the whole list of Monarchians, appeared as an advocate of anti-trinitarian views at Rome in the early part of the third

[1] Euseb., vii. 27-30; Theodoret, Hær. Fab., ii. 8; Epiphanius, Hær., lxv.

century, and was excommunicated in Alexandria in 261. In his teaching, the Trinity is regarded as purely modal, a Trinity of manifestations. Viewed in His original estate, God appears as the Monad, solitary and in rest. But this rest and isolation come to an end: God moves, speaks, becomes revealed by and in creation. As the outward-moving Spirit, the Creator and Ruler of the world at large, the revealed One, God is the Logos. Within the compass of His general revelation, there ensues a special revelation, in connection with the preparation and accomplishment of redemption. The revealed God became still further distinguished as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In the law, God revealed himself as Father; in the redemptive work of Christ on earth, as Son; in the sanctifying of believers, He reveals himself as Holy Spirit. These three titles are indicative, not of distinctions in the divine nature, but of stages in the divine economy; they denote the same divine Person under successive forms of manifestation.[1] This theory, it will be seen, provides rather for a theophany than for a divine incarnation in the proper sense. It teaches a transient abiding of God in the flesh, instead of a permanent union of God and man in the person of Jesus Christ.

VI.—THE CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS AND THEOLOGY.

Great as was the in-rushing flood of heresies, the Church found against it a good defence. That defence consisted in the self-evidencing power of divine truth,

[1] Euseb., vii. 6; Epiphanius, Hær., lxii; Theodoret, Hær. Fab., ii. 9.

propagating itself in the twofold channel of the written word and of tradition. At that time tradition was comparatively pure and vital: it embraced substantially the same contents as the New Testament, and indeed frequently served as a safeguard against arbitrary and capricious interpretations.

The Catholic writers of the period form several pretty clearly defined groups. First come the apostolic Fathers, including Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, Hermas, Papias, a certain Barnabas, the author of the epistle to Diognetus, and perhaps also the author of the recently discovered treatise, entitled "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." These writers were rather practical than speculative, more directly concerned with conduct than with dogma. Still, their productions are of no small doctrinal worth. Clement of Rome claims our special interest, as having written very near the apostolic age, if not indeed within its bounds. According to Eusebius, he presided over the Church of Rome from A.D. 92 to 101.[1] His proximity to the apostles, as well as his distinguished position as head of the Roman Church, explains the fact that his name was so largely employed for the recommending of heretical and spurious writings. But we have from him one writing, a somewhat lengthy epistle to the Corinthians, which is undoubtedly genuine. The identity of Clement with the Flavius Clemens who was put to death by Domitian is not at all probable, since early writers could hardly have failed to note the fact had it existed. More may be said in favor of the theory that he was the fellow-laborer mentioned by Paul (Phil. iv.

[1] Hist. Eccl., iii. 34.

3); but there is no adequate ground for a positive verdict. The epistle of Clement breathes a fine spirit, and gives excellent advice to the Corinthian brethren for the healing of their party strifes. Ignatius, who has already been introduced to us in the history of martyrdom, was the author of seven epistles, which are noteworthy, among other things, for the emphatic view of the episcopal dignity which they inculcate. The fact that the epistles appear in different versions, a longer and a shorter Greek, and also a Syriac version of three of them, has given occasion to a prolonged canvassing of the Ignatian literature. The weight of authority seems finally to be decidedly in favor of the shorter Greek version. The spuriousness of the other epistles, eight in number, attributed to Ignatius, is matter of common consent. Polycarp, who has also been brought to our notice in the records of martyrdom, wrote an epistle to the Philippians. Barnabas, whose name is attached to an epistle, was an early writer; but his fanciful allegorizing of the Old Testament, and headlong dealing with the law, forbid the supposition that he was Paul's distinguished companion of the same name. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, a friend and contemporary of Polycarp, is introduced to us chiefly by a few fragments quoted by early writers from his work entitled "Explanation of the Lord's Discourses." Hermas, the supposed author of "The Pastor of Hermas," a work that enjoyed great esteem in the early Church, is mentioned by the Canon of Muratori as the brother of the Roman bishop Pius, who entered upon his office toward the middle of the second century. Beyond this, history offers no definite testimony. Some, indeed, have concluded, from the ref-

erence of Hermas to a certain Clement,[1] that he wrote as early as the time of the Roman Clement; but it is neither certain that the reference is to the Roman bishop, nor, if it were, that it implies that he was still living. In a writing of this class, it is surely quite conceivable that the author may have chosen to lay the scene a little apart from his actual surroundings. There is no warrant for great positiveness respecting the date. As to the merits of the production, it must be granted that it is not specially rich in content; still, it is interesting as being so early a specimen of that order of composition in which the genius of Bunyan has been immortalized. Under the form of vision or allegorical representations, it inculcates a somewhat ascetic type of piety.

The topic of a preceding section has already given us occasion to mention the next group of writers, the apologists of the second century. A number of these, as was dictated by their philosophical training, as well as by the task of defending Christianity, made a noteworthy advance in the direction of dogmatic construction. Here belong in particular Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Theophilus. The name of Tatian might also be added, since he occupied a Catholic standpoint at the time that he wrote his "Address to the Greeks." The works of Justin Martyr are of considerable compass, and afford important evidence as to current beliefs. The most important are the two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho. The genuineness of these three is beyond dispute. Among other writings attributed to Justin, "The Address to the Greeks,"

[1] Vision, ii. 4.

"The Sole Government [or unity] of God," and a treatise on the Resurrection may have been from his hand. Athenagoras, a converted philosopher of Athens, is known to us by two writings, his "Plea for Christians" and his "Defence of the Resurrection." Both are superior works in style and content. Athenagoras was one of the most finished writers of the second century. From Theophilus, a scholarly bishop of Antioch, we have a single apologetic composition, addressed to a heathen acquaintance by the name of Autolycus.

From the latter part of the second century to the latter part of the third, a conspicuous place among Eastern theologians was filled by the Alexandrian school, — a school distinguished by its broad, eclectic, and idealistic bent. Its principal representatives were Pantænus, Clement, Origen, and Dionysius. From the hand of the first, who was a converted Stoic philosopher, only a few fragments are extant. The principal works which have come down to us from Clement are "The Exhortation to the Greeks," "The Educator," and "The Stromata," or Miscellanies. Though mixed and desultory in their method, even beyond the average of patristic literature, the writings of Clement are of high interest and worth. They show broad learning, and contain many a gleam of philosophic insight as well as of noble sentiment. Origen was the most fertile writer of the ante-Nicene Church. Aside from his extensive labors on the text of the Old Testament, he wrote commentaries on the major part of the Bible, a system of theology entitled "De Principiis," and an extended apology in answer to the attack of Celsus against Christianity. Early writers refer also to numer-

ous other writings from his pen which are no longer extant. In many points, Origen made noteworthy contributions to Christian thought. At the same time, he was a daring pioneer, and occasionally pushed out into speculations which had no sufficient basis in revelation. Dionysius, a disciple of Origen, was a writer of more than average strength and fruitfulness; but only fragments of his works remain. Among those who affiliated with the Alexandrian school as disciples, friends, or admirers of Origen, a prominent place belongs to Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus; Pamphilus, a presbyter and theological teacher at Cæsarea in Palestine; and Julius Africanus, the first Christian chronographer. Methodius, on the other hand, figures as the first conspicuous censor of Origen's teachings.

Among those who labored and wrote on Western soil, two of the most eminent — namely, Irenæus and Hippolytus — were of Eastern birth; at least, such was the case with the former, and in all probability it was the same with the latter. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons (178–202), and author of an extensive work, "Against Heresies," is commended to us in general by his moderation and clear judgment, both as an administrator and as a theologian. Hippolytus, reputed to have been Bishop of Portus Romanus,[1] and in any case a resident of Rome or its neighborhood, is celebrated as the author of a learned work entitled "Philosophumena," or Refutation of all Heresies." Many other treatises also were written by him, the majority of which have failed to be transmitted. He was probably the most learned

[1] A tradition to this effect is found in the seventh century.

writer of the era in the West. It is evident from the "Philosophumena" that he belonged to the party of rigorists on the subject of Church discipline, and was deeply dissatisfied with the policy of the bishops of Rome; but there is hardly ground for the conclusion that he anticipated the schism of Novatian, and became actually a separatist.[1]

Tertullian, who leads the train of Latin Fathers proper, left the impress of his remarkable energy and genius upon a long list of writings. Among those having the greatest dogmatic import are the works entitled "Against Marcion," "Against Praxeas," "On the Præscription against Heretics," "On the Soul." Minucius Felix, a contemporary of Tertullian, is brought to our attention by his skilful and attractive apology entitled "Octavius." Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (248–258), like other great administrators, made his most valuable contribution to Christian literature in the form of epistles. Novatian, the schismatic bishop of Rome in the time of Cyprian, was the author of a treatise on the Trinity. He is to be reckoned among Catholic writers, notwithstanding his schismatic position, since he was as orthodox in his general teaching as the majority of his contemporaries. From Commodian, who wrote near the middle of the third century, we have two religious poems, which contain some rather peculiar notions respecting the Antichrist. Arnobius is known by his apology, which, as already

[1] Döllinger, in his Hippolytus and Kallistus, has defended the view that Hippolytus was not Bishop of Portus, but rather a schismatic bishop of Rome. A presentation of the counter-view is given by Bishop Wordsworth, St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome (2d edition, 1880).

intimated, was more pungent in its attack against heathen errors, than discreet in its presentation of Christian truth.[1]

In many details these representatives of the Catholic theology no doubt differed widely from each other; yet it is manifest that there must have been an extensive consensus on the fundamental tenets of Christianity, for otherwise the flood of heresies would have met no such effectual breakwater as it actually did encounter.

In the reply to heresy, three sources of evidence were adduced, — Scripture, apostolic tradition, and reason. The refutation of Monarchianism was conducted mainly on the basis of Scripture. This was natural, since the Monarchians in general were at one with the Catholic writers in their view of the sacred canon. In dealing with Gnostics, on the other hand, inasmuch as they made free to reject large parts of the Scriptures, or to spirit away their sense by the most far-fetched allegorizing, it was found necessary to lay much stress upon apostolic tradition. The churches, it was claimed, which could show an unbroken succession of bishops reaching back to the apostles, were to be presumed to have the true understanding of the apostolic teaching. At the same time, those portions of the canon which the Gnostics accepted were utilized to prove their obligation to acknowledge the rejected portions. The fantastic conceits of the Gnostics were also severely criticised, as being contrary to all sober reason, a confused medley of notions stolen from the various heathen philosophies. Jewish heresy proper received little at-

[1] A full and valuable account of the patristic literature of the period may be seen in Schaff's Church History, vol. ii.

tention. By most writers it was rather stated than combated. After the middle of the second century, it was evidently considered an insignificant factor.

As respects the content of the Catholic theology, only the most general statement will be appropriate here, the full treatment of the subject being properly relegated to a special branch; namely, to the history of Christian doctrine. In such a formative era we should not expect to find very thorough dogmatic construction, or great definiteness in belief. Still, in every department of theology there were ideals, more or less clearly defined, which commanded the allegiance of the great body of Christians. As respects the subject of the Trinity, the Catholic Church — by which is meant the great body of Christians of that age who were in communion with each other [1] — acknowedged Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, understanding under these terms pre-temporal, personal, and permanent distinctions in the Godhead. Much less attention was given to the doctrine of the Spirit than to that of the Son. In the attempt to formulate the latter, some theologians were guilty of defects, judging them by later standards of the Church. The image, nevertheless, of Christ which was before the minds of Catholic Christians was that of a being of divine essence and dignity. As respects Christology, the Church acknowleged in general terms the co-existence of the divine and the human in Christ. On the subject of anthropology, it held substantially the teachings which have remained current in the Greek Church, — teachings less radical, as concerns

[1] We observe here, once for all, that in this work we never use the word "Catholic" as the equivalent of "Roman Catholic."

the results of the fall and the natural depravity of men, than those which were afterwards adopted in the Latin Church through the influence of Augustine. The subject of soteriology, or redemption, was not very thoroughly developed; still, the germs of subsequent theories were supplied by various writers. As respects eschatology, millenarian views were more widely prevalent than has been the case at any subsequent era in the history of the Church.

CHAPTER IV.

CHURCH CONSTITUTION AND DISCIPLINE.

I — THE CLERICAL HIERARCHY.

1. EMPHASIZING THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN CLERGY AND LAITY. — While the Church had its special officers from the outset, these were not at first, with the exception of the apostles, widely distinguished from the general body of believers. A priesthood in the more emphatic sense was not congenial to the thought of the first generations of Christians. The ministry were not set up as the sole dispensers of grace, over against whom all other Christians must take the place of children still in their minority and incapable of any independent agency. "The distinction," says Ritschl, "between the active and the passive members of the congregation, — in other words, the Catholic conception of priesthood, — is foreign to the first two centuries."[1] The fact that a majority of ecclesiastical officers continued, after their election, to pursue their worldly callings, was adverse to very wide distinctions in the Church. Still more adverse was the high conception taken of the common privilege of believers. All were regarded as partakers of the Spirit. Post-apostolic writers evince something of the same consciousness of the high privi-

[1] Albrecht Ritschl, Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche.

lege pertaining to the ordinary Christian standing as appears in the writings of Peter, John, and Paul. The Apostolic Constitutions, notwithstanding their hierarchical tone, use this language: "Though a man be a layman, if skilful in the word and grave in his manners, let him teach."[1] That this principle was sometimes acted upon, we know from the Palestinian bishops who employed Origen to interpret the Scriptures before their congregations, and defended themselves against the objections of the Bishop of Alexandria by affirming that they were guilty of no innovation, that "wheresoever there are found those qualified to benefit the brethren, these are exhorted by the holy bishops to address the people."[2] Tertullian declares, in very plain and emphatic terms, that all Christians are priests by inherent right; though, for the sake of order and convenience, certain ones are, under ordinary circumstances, to be set apart for the administration of ordinances and for directing in government and discipline. He asks, "Are not even we laics priests?" "Where three are," he says, "a church is, albeit they be laics. For each individual lives by his own faith, nor is there exception of persons with God."[3] While he protests, in the name of the peace and unity of the Church, against a layman's assuming to baptize in a case where a clergyman is accessible, he says with equal positiveness, "Even laymen have the right; for what is equally received can be equally given. Unless bishops or priests or deacons be on the spot, disciples are called. The word of the Lord ought not to be hidden by any; in like manner, too, baptism, which is

[1] viii. 32. [2] Hist. Eccl., vi. 19. [3] De Exhort. Cast., vii.

equally God's property, can be administered by all."[1] Irenæus says in one place, "All the righteous possess the sacerdotal rank."[2] The same representation appears with Origen.[3] "All Christians," as he teaches, "are priests, not merely or pre-eminently the office-bearers, but all according to the measure of their knowledge and their services in the kingdom of the Lord."[4] In practice, also, the right and power of the laity were recognized. It was the general custom that the selection of the bishops should be submitted to their approval.[5] Even Cyprian, the vigorous champion of order and authority, did not think it fitting to exclude the laity from a share in the management of the Church. He speaks of himself as having made up his mind from the commencement of his episcopacy to take no important step without asking the consent of the people as well as the advice of his clergy.[6] There is abundant evidence, therefore, that the more radical idea of priesthood did not dominate the Church in the first stages of its history.

Still, from the apostolic age onwards, there was an increasing tendency to widen the distance between clergy and laity. It was felt necessary to guard against the growing dangers of heresy and schism by emphasizing the dignity of the standing officers and leaders of the Church. As numbers and wealth increased, there was both more occasion and more opportunity for the ministry to abandon secular callings, and to give them-

[1] De Bapt., xvii. See also De Monog., vii., xii.
[2] Cont. Hær., iv. 8. 3.
[3] Hom. in Lev., ix. 1. 9; Tom. in Joan., i. 3.
[4] Redepenning, Origenes, ii. 436, 437. [5] Cons. Apost., viii. 4.
[6] Epist., v. 4, in Ante-Nicene Lib., in Oxford ed., epist. xiv.

selves wholly to their sacred vocation. Jewish ideas upon the subject of the priesthood unduly colored the thinking of some minds. As the heathen world had also its sacrificing priesthood, converts from within its borders not unnaturally were inclined to seek in Christianity for a counterpart to their old system of altars and officiating priests. From these several causes, there resulted a positive growth of priestly ideas and customs. As early as the closing part of the second century, there was a noticeable drift towards sacerdotalism, or the high-church theory of Christ's kingdom on earth. The freer stand-point was not yet forgotten, as appears from the statements which have been quoted from leading writers. The Church remained still, in the main, at no small distance from the full Romish conception of priestly rank and mediation. Nevertheless, the more liberal position was not maintained with clear understanding and entire consistency. Some of the writers who strongly asserted the common priesthood of believers employed also at times a phraseology which might be interpreted in favor of sacerdotalism. The convenience of a high ecclesiastical power, as a safeguard against the forces of disorder and anarchy, began so to engross the vision of many Christians, that they gave no proper attention to the dangers to personal freedom which such a power, unchecked, would be sure to involve.[1]

[1] The second book of the Apostolic Constitutions contains some statements well suited to serve as a basis of hierarchical pride and theocratic rule. Such, for example, is the declaration that the priestly office excels the kingly by as much as the soul is more excellent than the body (ii. 34).

2. Growth of Episcopacy. — Five different stages in the growth of the episcopal system may be noticed: (1) the establishment of the distinction between presbyters and bishops; (2) the emphasizing of the bishop's importance; (3) the rise of metropolitans, or archbishops; (4) the rise of patriarchs, or bishops having jurisdiction over important divisions of the Empire; (5) a striving after a common episcopal centre, a bishop of all bishops. These different stages were not successive in the sense that one was fully completed before another was begun: they were in part contemporaneous. Still, the order given expresses the logical succession of developments within the episcopacy.

As regards the first stage, there is much obscurity. It was probably accomplished in some regions earlier than in others. Clement of Rome, whose writings cannot well be placed earlier than the closing years of the first century, indicates no consciousness of any distinction between bishops and presbyters in the Corinthian church. He speaks of sedition, not against the authority of a bishop, but against the presbyters, and exhorts to submission to the presbyters.[1] The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles in like manner implies but two orders in the ministry. One of its directions is this, "Appoint for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord."[2] The epistles of Ignatius, on the other hand, show that in the early part of the second century, a considerable portion of the Church, especially that in Asia Minor, recognized a clear distinction between

[1] Epist. ad Corinth., xlvii., lvii.

[2] Chapter xv. This is regarded as one of the evidences in favor of the early origin of this document.

bishops and presbyters, and regarded the former as individual heads of the different churches. How much of the Church had adopted this *régime* at that time, cannot be determined. Certainly, it was soon thereafter the common *régime* of the Church. The adoption of the new system, however, did not abolish all traces of the original identity of bishops and presbyters. Later writers now and then used terms not accurately descriptive of the ecclesiastical constitution of their own times, terms indicative of a different and more primitive order. Irenæus, for example, calls those who possessed "the succession from the apostles" presbyters in some instances,[1] while in other connections he names them bishops. Even Cyprian, in one of his epistles, names the presbyters under him *compresbyteros;* and the Ambrosian Hilary in the fourth century wrote, "He is bishop, *qui inter presbyteros primus est.*"

By what authority was this change, which elevated one man in each local church above the board of presbyters, and caused him to be known distinctively as the bishop, effected? Was it the product of a positive apostolic appointment, or was it simply a natural outcome from the conditions, and finding its principal sanction in general consent? It would be difficult to prove that no one of the apostles, especially the Apostle John, whose administration of the churches of Asia Minor extended nearly to the close of the first century, had any thing to do with the change. On the other hand, the proof of any apostolic supervision of the matter is equally wanting. To be sure, in the time of Irenæus, it was somewhat customary to speak of a regular succes-

[1] Cont. Hær., iii. 2. 2; iv. 26. 2.

sion of bishops from the apostles onwards; but this habit may have resulted in large part from a disposition to judge past by existing conditions, and might very naturally have been indulged if the connecting links with the great majority of the apostles were not bishops proper, but only leading and influential presbyters. In fact, the language of Irenæus, as cited above, suggests that the connection may have been made in this way.

It is easily conceivable that the office of bishop grew up by a gradual development, which had its starting-point in the board of presbyters. This board in the several churches would naturally come to have its presiding officer. Men of the greatest energy and ability would be called to fill this position. The interests of unity and efficient management would cause more and more power to be delegated to them, until they should become really the chiefs of the churches, or bishops proper. Analogy also may be quoted in favor of this theory. Other stages in the growth of the hierarchy were effected much in the manner here indicated for the first stage. By gradual advances, one bishop overtopped the other bishops in his neighborhood, and finally assumed toward them the relation of archbishop. Even among the deacons distinctions grew up, and one of the body in the different churches became known as the archdeacon. Surely it is no far-fetched suggestion, that a similar development raised one of the early presbyters in the various congregations to the rank of archpresbyter, and then carried him over the short interval between that and the primitive bishop. That episcopacy originated in this way, is the conclusion of not a few scholars, even in a Church which has made much of

apostolic succession. Bishop Lightfoot says of the evidences in the case, "They show that the episcopate was created out of the presbytery. They show that this creation was not so much an isolated act as a progressive development, not advancing everywhere at a uniform rate, but exhibiting at one and the same time different stages of growth in different churches."[1] Dean Stanley indorses the same view. The exigencies of the times, as he teaches, gave origin to the episcopal system by reenforcing "the almost universal law, which, even in republics, engenders a monarchical element."[2]

The first bishops were generally bishops of individual churches. In the larger cities, a number of congregations may have been under a single bishop, but these congregations were regarded as branches of the one city church. Each separate community had, as a rule, its own bishop. This is sufficiently proved by the great number of bishops found within a given territory. "From the small province of proconsular Asia, forty-two bishops were present at an early council; in the only half-converted province of North Africa, four hundred and seventy episcopal towns are known by name."[3] "Sometimes a bishopric," says Pressensé, "comprised only a hamlet. We read in the Coptic Constitution: 'Is there a spot where the little company of believers, competent to elect a bishop, does not amount to twelve, let them write to the neighboring churches, if these are

[1] Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, Dissertation I.

[2] Christian Institutions.

[3] Edwin Hatch, Organization of Early Christian Churches. In the view of Hatch, management of the finances was a large part of the function of the primitive bishop.

populous, and let three delegates be sent to ascertain with care who is worthy to undertake this office.' "[1]

Already, in the infancy of the episcopate, began the second stage of development, that of express emphasis upon its importance. Ignatius of Antioch was the first to represent this stage. Again and again, in his epistles, he urges obedience to the bishop, warns against doing any thing without the bishop, represents the bishop as standing to the congregation as the vicegerent of Christ. At the same time, he regarded each bishop as limited to his own congregation, and recognized no essential distinctions within the episcopal body. Ignatius, however, appears to have been an exception to his age, in the degree of emphasis which he put upon the episcopal dignity. He stands so nearly alone in this respect, that some have been disposed to question the genuineness of the epistles attributed to him. Baur declares it impossible that any writer of so early an age could have uttered such high episcopal notions as appear in the so-called Ignatian Epistles. But this is extreme. Ignatius, though not a representative of his age as a whole in this matter, was no impossible phenomenon for that era. He was a man of vigorous personality, naturally in favor of strong rule and centralized power. The churches in his region were threatened, to an alarming degree, by the spirit of heresy and schism. No better antidote against this spirit seemed to him available, than an obedient temper toward that central authority which in each church was vested in the bishop. Where all the members of a congregation obey one person, there is little chance for schism in that congregation.

[1] Christian Life and Practice, Book I., chap. ii.

Church unity was his great motive in emphasizing the importance of the bishop. He was not interested to disparage the presbyters, and, indeed, speaks of the honor due to them in conjunction with the bishop. "Do nothing," he writes, "without the bishop and presbyters."[1] Among later writers, Irenæus and Cyprian, the latter in particular, were conspicuous for the advocacy of the episcopal dignity. The motives with them were the same as with Ignatius. They were lovers of law and order. Disrupting forces were at work in the Church. By a natural reaction, they emphasized the elements of central control. In this they were, to a degree, exponents of the tendencies of their times. The reaction awakened by Gnosticism and Montanism contributed much to the growth of the hierarchy.

The third stage, the rise of archbishops, was effected by obvious causes, but required a considerable time for its completion. Since the gospel was first preached in the large cities, these became centres of evangelization for the surrounding districts. Naturally, a very close relation subsisted between the mother church and the congregations organized by her missionary efforts. The high responsibilities of the episcopal office in the great cities tended to bring to such positions men of stamp and reputation. Apart from their personal qualities, their very position would give them a certain authority. Nothing was more natural, then, than to appeal to them in case of dispute. Prerogatives, awarded in the first instance by mere custom, could easily acquire in time a constitutional force. Hence, a kind of jurisdiction

[1] Epist. ad Magnes., vii.

over the surrounding territory became attached to the bishops of large cities, and the rank of archbishop more or less definitely established.

The patriarchal system was only a further illustration of the tendencies just described. Among the large cities, a few held by far the superiority, and their bishops were able to claim in course of time a corresponding importance and breadth of jurisdiction. Of the five patriarchates that were ultimately acknowledged, three had become established by the year 325; namely, those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch.

To complete the hierarchical scheme, it only remained to fix upon an episcopal centre, to assign to one bishop a constitutional supremacy over all the rest. This result was not reached in the first centuries, and, indeed, has never been reached. While the theory of such a supremacy was finally worked out, and asserted in behalf of the Roman bishop, Christendom has at no time been united in its acceptance. As regards the first three centuries, we have to deal only with tendencies toward this species of episcopal supremacy. We shall find here no pope, in the later sense of that term. The claim for that dignity, and the acknowledgment of it, are both wanting.

By the close of the second century, the Roman bishops began to magnify their position. An endeavor was made, in case of controverted questions, to force their preferences upon the Church at large.[1] Somewhat

[1] It is quite obvious that this might transpire apart from any theory of constitutional prerogatives. Even were the bishops constitutionally on a precise equality, one favored with outward means of superior influence would be very likely, especially if he were by nature of an aggres-

later, there are indications that they took pride in calling themselves the successors of Peter.[1] All this, however, was far from a claim to universal sovereignty of a constitutional sort. To be a successor of Peter in that age, by no means implied a constitutional supremacy over the whole Church. As applied to the Roman bishop, it ascribed to him a peculiar prestige in virtue of his following the great apostle in the government of the church of the imperial city. The language of Chrysostom at a later day, when he spoke of the Bishop of Antioch as possessing the chair of Peter, is not a little significant of the sense in which similar terms were primarily applied to the Bishops of Rome. Even in their highest assumptions in the first centuries, they confessed, in effect, their lack of constitutional sovereignty over Christendom. For example, Victor, in contrast with the moderation of his predecessors, assumed to excommunicate the churches of proconsular Asia and its neighborhood, on account of their position on the Easter question. He "endeavored," says Eusebius, "to cut off the churches of all Asia, together with the neighboring churches, as heterodox, from the common unity. And he publishes abroad by letters, and proclaims, that all the brethren there are wholly excommunicated."[2] But what did this excommunication imply? In the absence of the acquiescence and corroboration of other churches, it simply denied to the

sive temper, to press his views upon his colleagues. Indeed, no more instances of this kind are on record for the Roman bishops of the second and third centuries than might have been expected on any view of their constitutional powers.

[1] Epist., lxxiv. (in works of Cyprian), by Firmilian.

[2] Hist. Eccl., v. 24.

churches of Asia Minor communion with the local church of Rome. Victor may have presumed upon the acquiescence of the other churches, whose views were like his upon the Easter question. If so, he presumed wrongly. Other churches felt free to maintain communion with those from whom Victor had withdrawn. When matters were brought to the test, the Roman bishop found that he could decide only for himself on the policy of excommunication, and, so far as can be judged, ceased to press the case. The outcome indicates that he was by no means assured of his right and competency to exercise sovereign authority over the whole Church.

While some concessions were made to the dignity of the Roman bishop, none of these, when taken in their connections, reveal a conviction that any constitutional supremacy was inherent in him. Among the early writers, Irenæus and Cyprian used the terms most flattering to Rome. Tertullian, to be sure, in one instance applied to the Roman bishop higher epithets than are anywhere else found in the literature of the first three centuries, calling him the "sovereign pontiff, the bishop of bishops." But he used these terms in bitter irony, and with reference to a decree of the Roman prelate which he declared could not be posted with propriety, except "on the very gates of the sensual appetites."[1]

The most emphatic concession from Irenæus is expressed in the following language: Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam.[2] The proper translation of the phrase, *propter potiorem principalitatem*, is rendered

[1] De Pudicitia, i. [2] Cont Hær., iii. 3. 2.

very doubtful by the difficulty of conjecturing what was the Greek original. Gieseler thinks the sentence should read, "For with this Church [at Rome], on account of its superior originality, or primitiveness,[1] every Church must agree." This looks like a very strong statement. But observe the wording of the sentence, and especially its connections. Irenæus does not say that it is necessary to agree with the Roman bishop, but with the Roman Church. Very likely he had the bishop in mind more than any single officer beside; there is nothing, however, to enforce the conclusion that he would have attached more weight to his decision than to a decision generally agreed upon by the board of presbyters. Even if it be granted that he spoke with special reference to the bishop, the connection shows that he had no reference at all to his official prerogatives. The reference is solely to the precedence which came from superior means of correct information upon the doctrinal contents of Christianity. Irenæus was arguing against the Gnostic heretics. He wished to set forth a corrective to their arbitrary interpretations. He, therefore, pointed to the fact that there were numerous churches in which the apostles had labored, and in which the truths which they had preached had been handed down by a continuous line of successors. Since it would be tedious to mention all these churches, and prove a continuous succession in each of them, he said that he would fix upon one that had enjoyed special advantages for understanding and perpetuating Christian doctrine, — "the very great, the very ancient, and uni-

[1] ἱκανώτεραν ἀρχὴν, vorzüglicher Ursprünglichkeit. (*Kirchengeschichte*, § 49.)

versally known church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul." He mentioned this church as an eminent example of a class, not as one occupying a wholly exceptional position. He assumed that other apostolic churches were, as a matter of fact, in doctrinal agreement with this. For churches less favored, he indicated that the surest and most convenient way to arrive at pure traditions was to appeal to Rome. Very likely he fixed upon Rome in particular because he wrote in the West, and Rome was the only apostolic church in the West. The *animus* of his language is indicated by the parallel passage from Tertullian, who asserts that the final appeal, outside of the Scriptures, must be to the churches of apostolic origin and associations; Christians in the East appealing to Smyrna, Corinth, Philippi, and Ephesus, while Christians in Italy could most conveniently refer to Rome.[1] By the obligation to agree with Rome, Irenæus meant, as is shown by his whole line of thought, not a constitutional, but a moral, obligation. The obligation which he affirms was simply the duty to seek for truth at a source where it was most likely to be found, at least infinitely more likely to be found than in the chaotic domain of the Gnostics. Irenæus nowhere concedes a constitutional supremacy to the Roman bishop. He does not even call him the successor of Peter. "The blessed apostles," he says, "having founded and built up the church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate. Of this Linus, Paul makes mention in the Epistles to Timothy."[2] In one instance he applies the very

[1] De Præscript. Hærat., xxxii., xxxvi.
[2] Cont. Hær., iii. 3, 3.

modest title of presbyters to the succession of Roman bishops.[1] Finally he gave evidence by his conduct that he acknowledged no constitutional supremacy in the Roman prelate, writing a letter of rebuke to the headstrong and intolerant Victor, assuming the same right as he to address the churches, and addressing them counter to his policy. "Not only to Victor," says Eusebius, "but likewise to most of the other rulers of the churches, he sent letters of exhortation on the agitated question."[2]

As the most flattering tribute from Cyprian to Roman dignity, the following expression may be cited: *Petri cathedra atque ecclesia principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est* ("the throne of Peter and the chief church, whence sacerdotal unity has arisen").[3] A commentary on the meaning of this sentence is provided for us in a more extended passage, which, omitting the fraudulent items interpolated near the end of the sixth century, reads as follows (the reference being to Matt. xvi. 18–19; John xxi. 15, xx. 21): "Although to all the apostles, after His resurrection, He gives an equal power, and says, 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosesoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted unto him; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they shall be retained:' yet that He might set forth unity, He arranged by His authority the origin of that unity, as beginning from one. Assuredly the rest of the apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honor and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity, which one Church, also, the Holy Spirit in

[1] Euseb., v. 24. [2] Ibid. [3] Epist. liv., Ad Cornelium.

the Song of Songs designated in the person of our Lord, and says, 'My dove, my spotless one, is but one.'"[1] Had we only these passages before us, the intelligent conclusion would be, that Cyprian was dealing in types and figures when he connected the idea of ecclesiastical unity with Peter and the Roman Church; that he was speaking of them, not as factors in the actual constitution and government of the Church, but as the chosen means of a symbolical representation of Church unity. His line of thought amounts to this: Peter received no more authority than the other apostles, but Christ made an earlier mention of his authority in order that he might serve as an image of ecclesiastical unity. The worth of the whole representation is well expressed by Barrow, who says, "I can discern little solidity in this conceit, and as little harm."[2] But if the passages in Cyprian which lean most toward Rome are thus void of any real acknowledgment of a constitutional supremacy in the Roman bishop or Church, the unimpaired force of other passages must convince a candid mind, beyond all shadow of doubt, that Cyprian did not even dream of such a supremacy. He plainly regarded the bishops as one great fraternity, appointed to conserve the unity of the Church; each, while having his own more definite sphere of labor, inhering in the whole body, and all standing upon a substantial equality. His language in immediate connection with that quoted above is suggestive of this stand-point. "This unity," he says, "we ought firmly to hold and assert, especially those of us that are bishops who preside in the Church, that we may also prove the episcopate itself to be one and undivided.

[1] De Unitat. Ecclesiæ. [2] Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy.

The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each one for the whole." The statement, however, most clearly setting forth the equality of bishops, is found in his address to a council convened at Carthage to consider the question of the re-baptism of heretics. In this he says to his brother bishops: "It remains, that upon this same matter each one of us should bring forward what we think, judging no man, nor rejecting any one from the right of communion, if he should think differently from us. For neither does any of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical terror does any compel his colleague to the necessity of obedience; since every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another." This language, since it was uttered with special reference to the attempts of the Roman bishop Stephen[1] to force his views upon the North African Church, is a clear and absolute denial of any constitutional supremacy in the Roman bishop over the Church at large. And Cyprian's conduct throughout was in harmony with his address to the council. On the question of re-baptism, he refused to yield an iota to the demands of Stephen. In connection with another matter, also, he denied any superior jurisdiction in the Roman bishop, and counselled the Spanish Church not to reverse their action and restore some unworthy bishops (Basilides and Martialis) who had betrayed the authorities at Rome into espousing their cause. "Neither can it rescind," he wrote, "an ordination rightly

[1] Hefele is forced to suspect here an "Anspielung auf Papst Stephan." (*Conciliengeschichte*, § 6.)

perfected, that Basilides, after the detection of his crimes, and the baring of his conscience even by his own confession, went to Rome and deceived Stephen our colleague, placed at a distance, and ignorant of what had been done, and of the truth, to canvass that he might be replaced unjustly in the episcopate from which he had been righteously deposed."[1] Evidently the Bishop of Rome was to Cyprian only that which he names him in the above communication, — a *colleague;* a colleague possessing high honor on account of his eminent position, but nothing more than a colleague.

Some of the contemporaries of Cyprian gave as conspicuous a denial of the authority of the Roman bishop as that which we have from him. For example, Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in a letter written to Cyprian, charged Stephen with pride and audacity, accused him of rebelling against the sacrament and the faith with the madness of contumacious discord, and declared that he had cut himself off from the unity of love, and made himself a stranger in all respects from his brethren.[2]

A very decisive example of denial of universal jurisdiction in the Roman bishop occurred also in connection with the Easter controversy already mentioned. Polycrates, the venerable Bishop of Ephesus, replying to the demands of Victor, in the name of a synod of bishops, declared plainly that he was not at all alarmed by the things threatened against him, and had no intention whatever of departing from the custom which had been handed down by his predecessors.[3]

[1] Epist., lxvii. [2] Epist., lxxiv., in Works of Cyprian.
[3] Euseb., v. 24.

Taking the Church at large, the only primacy accorded to the Roman bishop in the first three centuries was a primacy of honor, or a certain precedence as regards the respect rendered. This was due in some degree to the fact that the Roman was an apostolic church, founded, according to current belief, by the two eminent apostles Peter and Paul. It was due in a much larger degree to the political pre-eminence of Rome. It is no exaggeration to say, that the political importance, the grandeur, and the imperial associations of the city of Rome were the pre-eminent factors in giving origin to the papacy. In the race for episcopal honor and power, the political importance of the various cities outweighed by far every other factor. Jerusalem, the mother of all churches, was for a long time the seat of a subordinate bishopric. The bishop there was of small account because the city was of small account, and rose to importance only as the city rose to importance, and became a favorite pilgrim resort. Antioch, though the first Christian centre after Jerusalem, and the scene of the labors of the very chief of apostles, was compelled to yield the palm to Alexandria. The importance of the see of Antioch became second to that of Alexandria because the city was second. Constantinople, built on the site of an obscure bishopric, overtopped both Antioch and Alexandria in episcopal honor; and her patriarch became well nigh a rival for the Bishop of Rome, simply because Constantinople rose to the greatest political importance of any city in the East. There is no mystery, therefore, about the genesis of the papacy. Before the building of Constantinople, Rome was what no city has been since, — the

capital of the civilized world. From her prestige the Roman bishop derived prestige. In the midst of tendencies toward ecclesiastical monarchy, he had a start and an advantage enjoyed by no other. The first three centuries, however, witnessed only growing ambition and pretension: they did not witness the beginning of the papacy in the sense of any acknowledgment of a constitutional supremacy in the Roman bishop over the Church at large.

II. — COUNCILS, CANONS, AND CONSTITUTIONS.

The growing sense of a demand for concerted action found expression at an early date in the assembling of synods, or councils. We find traces of such bodies at the middle of the second century, and during the third they were of frequent occurrence. Still, this period stands in marked contrast with the following, in that it witnessed no great representative assembly. Its councils were not above the provincial scale; none of them are classed as ecumenical.

In the membership of the councils, the bishops were the main factor. Not unfrequently, it is true, priests and deacons were present, and sometimes laymen were invited; but in most instances the decrees were signed only by the bishops.

Among the occasions for councils in these centuries were the rise of Montanism, the controversy on the time for celebrating Easter, the question respecting the validity of heretical baptism, the anti-trinitarian theories of Paul of Samosata and Beryllus, the disturbance in the Alexandrian Church over the irregular ordination

of Origen, and the exigencies of church discipline, together with different views upon the subject.

The record of some of these councils is almost wholly wanting. With others, especially that held by Cyprian on the subject of re-baptism, and that of Elvira, we have quite ample means of acquaintance. From the latter, which represented the Spanish Church in the year 305 or 306, eighty-one canons have been transmitted. Most of them relate to matters of discipline. Their tone indicates, that in Spain there was at this time more than an average zeal for a strict *régime*. An item of special interest is a decree in behalf of clerical celibacy, — the first recorded legislation on the subject. The thirty-third canon enjoins upon bishops, presbyters, and deacons abstinence from conjugal relations. The terms used are these: Placuit in totum prohibere episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconibus vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio, abstinere se a conjugibus suis et non generare filios; quicunque vero fecerit, ab honore clericatus exterminetur.[1] The thirty-sixth canon is also noteworthy as forbidding in the churches pictorial representations of objects of worship: Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur. In the first canon the severe principle is enjoined, that a baptized Christian of mature age, who has lapsed into idolatry, should be denied the communion even in the hour of death, as having been guilty of a capital crime.

While thus councils were developing a code for the

[1] The design of the canon is sufficiently obvious, though it is needful to substitute for *prohibere* a word of opposite meaning, to bring out the sense intended. A like usage may be observed in Canon 80.

guidance of their respective constituencies, a body of instructions, laws, and liturgical formularies was being prepared, which claimed for itself an ecumenical authority as bearing the seal of apostolic teaching and command. This was the so-called Apostolic Constitutions. The eight books of this somewhat elaborate collection no doubt contain much corresponding to actual usage in the early Church. They were written, in the main, before the Council of Nicæa. At the same time, individual statements, in the absence of confirmation from other sources, can be credited with only moderate weight; there being need of proof both that they were not interpolated at a comparatively late date, and also that they represent any thing more than a private opinion.

The Apostolic Canons, sometimes appended to the eighth book of the Constitutions, contain a list of directions for the clergy. The following are some of the more noteworthy provisions: "Let not a bishop, a priest, or a deacon cast off his own wife under pretence of piety" (Can. 6). "Let not a bishop, a priest, or deacon undertake the cares of the world" (Can. 7). "He who has been twice married after his baptism, or has had a concubine, cannot be made a bishop or presbyter or deacon, or indeed any one of the sacerdotal catalogue" (Can. 17). "If any bishop obtains that dignity by money, or even a presbyter or deacon, let him and the person that ordained him be deprived" (Can. 30). "We command that the bishop have power over the goods of the church" (Can. 41). "We do not permit servants to be ordained into the clergy without their masters' consent" (Can. 82). The origin of this col-

lection is not to be placed earlier than the middle of the fourth century. The Greek Church in 692 adopted as of binding force the full list of eighty-five canons. The Latin Church rejected the collection at first, but subsequently accepted a list of fifty canons.[1]

III. — DISCIPLINE.

Christ's deliverance of the keys to the apostles vested in them the full power of administering church discipline, from every thing connected with the reception of members to the extreme act of excommunicating from Christian fellowship. His assurance that whatsoever they should bind or loose on earth should be bound or loosed in heaven (Matt. xviii. 18), was based on the assumption that in their official acts they would be under the full guidance of the Holy Spirit. The power of the keys passed from the apostles to the Church. This power it is bound to exercise, as it is bound to give to its members the benefit of good government. The conditions of the right exercise of this power are the same as they were in its first bearers. A God-fearing, spiritual Church, earnestly intent upon ascertaining the mind of the Spirit, may hope to obtain the Divine approbation in its acts of administration and discipline; in other words, to have its binding and loosing upon earth confirmed in heaven. The promise of Christ supposes a competency which is no attachment of official position as such, no peculiar treasure of an ecclesiastical aristocracy which is passed along by the magical connection of one link with another, but an

[1] Hefele, vol. i., Anhang.

outgrowth of spiritual endowments. In the hands of a corrupt Church, the use of the keys is sure to be at the same time an abuse of them, — a binding and loosing in large part contrary to that which transpires in heaven. Even under the best conditions, an element of fallibility is likely to be mixed with the fulfilment of this serious responsibility.

As the Church of the first centuries was a purely religious organization, no penalty was thought of beyond that of excommunication. This was imposed for heresy, apostasy, crimes, and gross immoralities. The excommunicated was expected to give special tokens of repentance before restoration. Gradually a sort of established penitential discipline grew up for this class, and they were allowed only by successive stages to regain the full privileges of church fellowship. At the beginning of the fourth century, four stages appear to have been distinctly recognized: (1) that of the "weepers," who bewailed their sins at the church-doors; (2) that of the "hearers," who were allowed to hear the Scripture lessons and the sermon, but were to leave the sanctuary before the sacramental service; (3) that of the "kneelers," who might attend the public prayers only in a kneeling posture; (4) that of the "standers," who were permitted to remain, in a standing posture, through the entire service, but were not yet privileged to partake of the communion.

The question of greater or less strictness in discipline was in itself a question of high importance, and its significance was greatly enhanced by the number of those who lapsed or apostatized in the great persecutions. Some would delay restoration longer than others. Some

would deny restoration altogether to those who were guilty of certain grievous sins. The Church at large was never committed to this extreme, but there are indications that it early adopted a strict code in dealing with offenders against its own sanctity. Several writers speak as though it were an accepted maxim, that only a single fall after baptism can claim any indulgence. "If any one," says Hermas, "is tempted by the devil, and sins after that great and holy calling in which the Lord has called his people to everlasting life, he has opportunity to repent but once."[1] Tertullian in like manner observes that after baptism the door is opened but once to repentance.[2] "In the graver kinds of crimes," says Origen, "place for repentance is granted only once."[3] The usual practice of the Church he represents to have been as follows: "The Christians lament as dead those who have been vanquished by licentiousness or any other sin, because they are lost and dead to God; and as being risen from the dead (if they manifest a becoming change) they receive them afterwards, at some future time, after a greater interval than in the case of those who were admitted at first, but not placing in any office or post of rank in the Church of God those who, after professing the gospel, lapsed and fell."[4] A greater rigor was advocated by the Montanists, and found supporters in various quarters. As already stated, a canon of the Council of Elvira denied all hope of restoration to those who had sacrificed to idols. Tertullian, in the later, or Montan-

[1] Command., iv. 3.
[2] De Pœnit., vii. Compare Clement of Alexandria, Strom., ii. 13.
[3] Hom. in Lev., xv. 2. [4] Cont. Celsum, iii. 51.

ist, stage of his belief, affirmed that the Church is never authorized to restore those who have been expelled on account of such gross sins as adultery, fornication, murder, apostasy, and blasphemy.[1] On the other hand, the Roman bishops in the time of Tertullian began to distinguish themselves as the advocates of mildness. According to Hippolytus, who favored severity, mildness degenerated into laxity in the case of the Roman bishop Callistus; and he credits him with comparing the Church to the ark of Noah, in which were all manner of unclean animals as well as the clean.[2] Not long after Callistus, opposition to the milder *régime* culminated at Rome in the Novatian schism. Cyprian, who was contemporary with these developments at the great capital, inclined to an intermediate position. While he advocated suitable delay in the restoration of the lapsed, he would deny to none the hope of being ultimately admitted to the fellowship of the Church.

Confession of sins was a matter of frequent injunction. But in most cases the injunction had reference only to a penitential acknowledgment of sins before the congregation. Where the clergy were designated as the proper recipients of confession, they were so designated on the twofold ground that they were the most competent spiritual advisers and the proper overseers of discipline. Auricular confession to a priest, as the common obligation of all Christians, and the essential condition of absolution, was a thing foreign to the thought of the early Church. By absolution, apart from baptism, was understood, in the main, simply a loosing from ecclesiastical censures. In this, to be

[1] De Pudicit., i., ii., xix. [2] Philos., ix. 7.

sure, the bishop took a leading part, but he did not stand alone: the whole congregation joined in the prayer for the penitent,[1] after which the bishop gave the benediction as a fitting pledge of restoration and as an invocation of divine grace. Even Cyprian, who was perhaps more deeply tinged with sacerdotalism than any other prominent writer of the period, did not materially transcend this view of the episcopal, or priestly, absolution. He speaks only of those who had been cut off from the Church for known offences as having occasion to come to the priestly tribunal; and the prerogative which he assigns to the priest in relation to such, so far as their standing with God is concerned, is that of an intercessor offering sacrifices, which, as being well-pleasing to God, may solicit remission from Him. Beyond this, the priest stands between the penitent and God, only as he is the doorkeeper of the Church, and the Church is the way to God. No man, says Cyprian, can usurp the divine prerogative in the forgiveness of sins. "The Lord alone can have mercy. He alone can bestow pardon for sins which have been committed against Himself."[2] Quite as remote from the theory of judicial absolution is the language of Firmilian. Among the occasions, he says, for the yearly assembling of prelates and priests is this, "that some remedy may be sought for by repentance for lapsed brethren, and for those wounded by the devil after the saving laver, not as though they obtained remission of sins from us, but that by our means they may be converted to the understanding of their sins, and may be compelled to give fuller satisfaction to the

[1] Cons. Apost., ii. 41. [2] De Lapsis, xvii.

Lord."[1] It is in the light of this statement that the office of penitentiary presbyter, which, as we learn from the historian Socrates, had place in some of the churches after the Decian persecution, is to be interpreted.[2] Origen, while he emphasized the principle that the priest should be consulted as a spiritual adviser, was far from conceding to him a power to absolve from sins in simple virtue of his office.[3] Still, it must be allowed that the third century supplied in no small measure a basis for the later doctrine of priestly absolution. Not to speak of the general growth of sacerdotal conceptions, the stress which Cyprian and others placed upon the catholic unity was of the nature of such a basis. In proportion as they made union with the Catholic Church an indispensable condition of salvation, and assigned to the priest the position of doorkeeper in that Church, they inculcated the notion of dependence upon priestly mediation.

IV. — SCHISMS CONNECTED WITH QUESTIONS OF DISCIPLINE, — MONTANISM.

The schism of Novatus and Felicissimus, which arose in Carthage in the time of Cyprian, was due mainly to the spirit of faction. There was no very deep convic-

[1] Epist., lxxiv. 4 (or lxxv.), in works of Cyprian. Firmilian, it is true, in the same epistle speaks of the apostolic prerogative in the forgiveness of sins as having passed to the apostolic churches and their bishops. But, as the context shows, this is only another way of saying that the Catholic Church is the only true Church, the only one having a valid baptism, which is the rite of remission, the only one, therefore, which can give sure promise of remission. His words are no indication of an already existing sacrament of penance with its judicial sentence.

[2] A further consideration of this will be found in the next period.

[3] In Matt. Tom., xii. 14; Hom. in Lev., v. 4.

tion back of the plea put forth by the schismatics for a less rigid discipline. They seem to have maintained themselves but a short time. The Novatian schism at Rome, near the same time, was born of much more earnest sentiments; Novatian and his followers having a hearty attachment to a stringent discipline, and accusing the Catholic party of unchristian laxity. The Novatian sect showed great persistence. It spread in various regions, and traces of it appear as late as the sixth century. The Meletian schism, which arose in Egypt in the early part of the fourth century, was precipitated by a disagreement between Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, and his metropolitan, Peter of Alexandria. Meletius is said to have championed the cause of strict discipline in the spirit of aggression and insubordination. The schism lasted upwards of a century. The separatists affiliated with the Arians.

The most interesting and important of the parties which fell into a sectarian position on account of their views of church discipline were the Montanists. This party derived its name from Montanus, a native of Phrygia in Asia Minor, who assumed the rôle of a prophet and reformer in that region in the last half of the second century. Two female associates, Prisca (or Priscilla) and Maximilla, claimed likewise to be organs of the Divine Comforter promised of Christ.

Among the causes which contributed to the inauguration of Montanism, were the imaginative and enthusiastic temper characteristic of the Phrygians, the excitements of persecution, the memory of the glorious charisms of the apostolic age, and a reaction against the growing ecclesiasticism or exaltation of official rank.

As these causes, with the exception of the first, were more or less operative in the Church at large, they gave to Montanism a degree of prevalence much in excess of the importance of its founders. It soon numbered adherents in widely separated regions. The Church became much agitated on its account, and, after treating it with varying degrees of severity, finally assumed an attitude of decisive hostility. In Asia Minor, Montanism resulted in a separate sect (Cataphrygians, Priscillianists, or Pepuzians). In Rome, it was repressed, though not with entire success, since some of its principles found harborage among the Novatian schismatics. In North Africa, it was temporarily a considerable power, and after its apparent decline re-asserted itself in large part under new names. It found here also its one illustrious theologian, Tertullian. That he espoused Montanism with great heartiness, is entirely certain; but how this affected his local church relations, is largely a matter for conjecture. Ritschl thinks there is insufficient ground for the conclusion that he became a schismatic, and favors rather the verdict that the contemporary church authorities in his region were so far favorable to Montanism that there was for the time being no need of a separation.[1] Augustine, to be sure, found in his day a schismatic party bearing the name of Tertullianists; but, as Neander states, there is no adequate evidence that this party existed as a schismatic party in the days of Tertullian. They might very naturally claim him as their founder, had he given them simply their principles and not their sepa-

[1] Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche. Ritschl finds evidence for this view in a paragraph of Cyprian, Epist., li. (lv.) 21.

rate organization. Whether he died a schismatic or not, Tertullian was certainly held in high honor in the Catholic Church shortly after his death.

Montanism has sometimes been classed among the heresies. Its divergence, however, from the Catholic theology of the first centuries was not extensive, and was more in the line of addition than of rejection. The exhibition of its animating spirit was quite as much in the department of discipline, morals, and life, as in that of dogmatics proper; though here, too, it differed from the Church at large more in a quantitative than in a qualitative respect. Its distinguishing features may briefly be described as an ultra super-naturalism and an ascetic morality.

Montanism affirmed that a continuance of the charisms of the apostolic age was to be expected as the normal possession of the Church. "The fundamental error," says Pressensé, "which marred this grand inspiration, was the failure to comprehend the operation of Christianity except under the form of permanent miracle."[1] The Montanists laid great emphasis, not only upon the fact that they were living under the dispensation of the Spirit, but also upon the extraordinary workings of the Spirit. Especially did they regard prophesying as the means appointed by God for the edification and guidance of the Church; and the true condition for prophesying was in their view that form of ecstasy in which all self-control is lost, and the soul rendered utterly passive in the hands of God, — the condition of one in absolute trance. As regards the subject-matter of their prophesying, the Montanists

[1] Heresy and Christian Doctrine, Book I., chap. iv.

claimed the right to enter every region, even to the rendering of decisions upon questions of speculative theology. Their claim was really an open door toward the unsettling of existing revelation in the name of additional and supplementary disclosures of divine truth. The prophetic theme relished among them, perhaps more than any other, was that of the coming judgments of God, and the introduction of the millennial reign of Christ upon earth. The first Montanists believed that the day was already at hand when the Redeemer would appear to set up his kingdom. Said Maximilla, "After me will be no prophet, but the end will follow."[1] As the Montanists laid the chief stress upon the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and considered these gifts equally open to all classes, they were opposed to priestly exclusiveness and hierarchical pretension. At the same time, in their exaggerated preference for their prophets and those who acknowledged their authority, they introduced class distinctions of a very formidable character. The Montanist prophet was made to take the place of the bishop as respects dignity and authority, and the Montanists were ranged around the prophet as a superior caste. Indeed, one is almost reminded of the Gnostic classification, when he finds Tertullian stigmatizing as "psychics" the great body of Christians who refused to accept Montanism, and reserving the name of "spirituals" for the adherents of that system.[2]

In pursuance of its ascetic morality, Montanism urged an unsparing renunciation of the world, entire absti-

[1] Epiphanius, Hær., xlviii.

[2] See in particular his treatises on Monogamy, Modesty, and Fasting.

nence from public offices, and a rigid church discipline. It exalted the virtue of martyrdom, opposed all use of prudential means to escape the persecutor's rage; affirmed the obligation to fast till evening on every Wednesday and Friday, and to abstain from the eating of flesh and luxuries for two weeks in each year; denounced second marriages, and, while allowing the legitimacy of a first marriage, expressed more or less preference for celibacy. Regarding the Church as properly the assembly of the holy, the Montanists argued for a stern treatment of those who violated its sanctity. For lesser sins, committed after baptism and reception into the Church, there must be a show of radical repentance; while mortal sins, such as adultery and apostasy, committed by one in these holy relations, must be punished by irremediable excommunication. God may, perhaps, pardon one thus sundered from Christian fellowship; but the Church is not authorized to proclaim His pardon by restoring the culprit to its communion. In all this, great moral earnestness may be discerned, but also an excessive rigor and spirit of legality.

Through repelling Montanism, the Catholic Church reproduced some of its peculiarities. The infallibility claimed for the Montanist prophets came finally to be asserted of the episcopal hierarchy, and practically was credited in the latter, as much as ever it was in the former, with the power to add to the Scripture revelation. Again, the ascetic tendencies of Montanism found a parallel, or rather were transcended, in the wide-spread system of Monasticism, which came to be treated by the Catholic Church as a favored child.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AND LIFE.

I.—SACRED TIMES.

1. SUNDAY AND SUNDAY SERVICES. — There are clear indications that the first day of the week was from the outset a special day to the Christians (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2). Already in the apostolic age, it acquired the name of the "Lord's Day" (Rev. i. 10). Writers following close upon the apostolic age state plainly that it was a day specially observed by the Church. The letter of Pliny to Trajan certifies us that the Christians were accustomed to meet for worship on a "stated day," and other sources of information leave no doubt that his reference was to the first day of the week. Ignatius of Antioch, who also wrote during the reign of Trajan, speaks of those who had come into possession of the new Christian hope, as "no longer observing the sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lord's Day."[1] The Epistle of Barnabas says: "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus arose from the dead."[2] The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles assigns Christian worship to the "Lord's Day."[3] "On the day called Sunday," says Justin Martyr, "all who live in the cities or in the country gather together to one place."[4] All time was counted

[1] Epist. ad Magnes., ix. [2] Chap. xv. [3] xiv. 1. [4] 1 Apol., lxvii.

sacred by the early Christians. "To the perfect Christian," said Origen, "all his days are the Lord's, and he is always keeping the Lord's day;"[1] but evidently Sunday was pre-eminently the sacred day of the early Church.

In what sense was Sunday a sacred day? Was it regarded as the Jewish sabbath transferred from the last to the first day of the week, a day coming under the positive prescription of the Fourth Commandment? By no means. All the writings of the first three centuries are destitute of any intimation of such a belief. The unmixed impression which comes from the perusal of this whole body of literature is, that the Christian sacred day was viewed as independent of the Jewish, having indeed a certain kinship with it as respects use and design, but in its origin and sanctions just as distinct from it as Christian baptism was from Jewish circumcision. Not one of the Fathers of this period so much as hints that he finds in Sunday a commemoration of God's rest from the work of creation. Not one of them betrays the least consciousness that the Fourth Commandment was to be looked upon as applying to Sunday. That which Sunday was regarded as celebrating, was no event connected with the physical creation (except the creation of light, as referred to by Justin Martyr), no event of Jewish history, but the crowning event of the ministry of redemption, the resurrection of Christ. It was the festival of the resurrection, the day of holy rejoicing, on which fasting or even kneeling in prayer was counted inappropriate. So far were the early Fathers from seeing in Sunday the old Jewish sabbath with all

[1] Cont. Celsum, viii. 22. Compare Hom. in Gen. x. 3.

its sanctions, only carried over from the last to the first day of the week, that we find several of them specifying the abolition of the latter. Justin Martyr and Tertullian state expressly, that, like circumcision, the sabbath is under Christianity abolished.[1] What could be more distinct than these words from the latter of these writers? "The precept [to keep the Sabbath] was not eternal nor spiritual, but temporal, which would one day cease. . . . It was not with a view to its observance in perpetuity, that God formerly gave them such a law." Irenæus also indicates that he did not consider the sabbath law of the old dispensation as having any statutory force under the new dispensation, speaking of it as being like circumcision, a type or sign of something beyond itself, a sign, namely, "that we should continue day by day in God's service."[2] The broad distinction apprehended between the Jewish and the Christian day is indicated also by the tone of the first statement which we find of an obligation to abstain from secular work on Sunday. This is in a writing of Tertullian, not earlier than the end of the second century, and reads as follows: "Only on the day of the Lord's resurrection ought we to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude, deferring even our business, lest we give any place to the devil."[3] Tertullian here refers the obligation to abstain from business on Sunday, not to any Old-Testament command, not even to apostolic tradition, but to the need of having the outward conditions favorable to that state of mind which is appropriate to the day.

[1] Dial. cum Tryph., xviii., xix.; Adv. Judæos, iv.; Adv. Marc., v. 4.
[2] Cont. Hær., iv. 16.
[3] De Orat., xxiii.

Sunday, in virtue of the event which it celebrates, ought to be to Christians a day of joy, peace, and tranquillity of soul; to avoid needless distraction, worldly business should be suspended: such is the sum-total of his argument. A later passage, in the Apostolic Constitutions,[1] brings forward the same grounds for making Sunday a day of rest. How far the early Church agreed with Tertullian in recognizing an obligation to abstain from labor on the Lord's Day, is difficult to determine. No doubt, from the beginning of Christianity, the requirements of public worship made it in part a day of abstinence from secular toil. But, on the other hand, there is no indication of any positive prohibition of such toil within the first two centuries. This, taken in connection with the fact that the Sunday laws of Constantine included no prohibition of agricultural employment, would favor the conclusion that it was only gradually that the Church came to *insist* upon refraining from worldly business on Sunday. The natural demands of a specially sacred day, more than any thing else, brought about the result. Secular work interfered with the wish to distinguish and to hallow the first day of the week above all other days: hence, naturally, a growing demand that it should be suspended on this day. As regards the Jewish sabbath, many Jewish Christians no doubt continued for a time to observe it, but its observance was never imposed upon Gentile Christians.

The stand-point of the early Church upon this subject will probably be regarded by many as something to be deplored. It is certainly quite in contrast with a tradi-

[1] viii. 33.

tional view which still prevails through a considerable range. One accustomed to regard the Fourth Commandment as a statute perpetually in force can hardly fail to think that the early Fathers greatly erred in discarding this as a sanction of the Christian sacred day. No doubt, they might have credited it with a somewhat larger significance than they did. It was at least a grand historical precedent, providentially designed to supply the general model of the Christian week. It is a standing and most impressive testimony to the need of a sacred day in the training of Israel, and, by implication, in the training of mankind. But, on the other hand, it remains to be proved that the early writers were decidedly in the wrong in assigning a relative independence to the Christian day, and in founding it upon the great fact of the resurrection, rather than upon a prescription in the Mosaic legislation. Indeed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, there is a fair presumption that in this they were only following the tenor of apostolic teaching. The apostles, as men trained in Judaism, and habitually associating the seventh day with the Creator's rest, could naturally feel no incentive to connect its law with a day commemorating a totally different event, namely, the resurrection of Christ. We consider it every way probable, therefore, that the Fourth Commandment, while influential in supplying the model of the Christian week, was never quoted by the apostles as a positive sanction or prescription for the first day of the week. This seems to leave us without a definite scriptural command for the observance of Sunday. True, but an ample equivalent is given. The historical precedent supplied by the Fourth

Commandment, the essential fitness of commemorating the great event of the new dispensation, the custom of making the first day of the week a special day for worship while the Church was still under the supervision of the apostles, the dictate of reason that man as a physical and moral being needs a day of rest and devotion, the testimony of centuries to the blessed results of having a recurring sacred day, — all this will constitute for the intelligent Christian as valid a "thus saith the Lord," as any formal statute which could be issued from a flaming Sinai.

Before the close of the apostolic age, the custom seems to have become well established to hold a twofold service on the first day of the week, a morning and an evening service. The letter of Pliny to Trajan plainly indicates the existence of this custom in the early part of the second century. But soon after that date, the evening service, as being especially obnoxious to Roman suspicion, was omitted. The love-feast which had constituted an important part of that service was left out altogether from the Sunday worship. The description of Justin Martyr, already referred to, will serve to bring before us the main features of the public worship as it existed after these changes had been effected. "On the day called Sunday," he writes, "all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray; and as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine

and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen. And there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given; and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who through sickness or any other cause are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the sojourner among us, and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need."[1] From this account, it appears that the celebration of the eucharist, and the taking of a collection for the poor, were parts of the regular Sunday service. Justin says nothing about the dismissal of the general congregation before the eucharist was celebrated; but that became the custom at the close of the second century, and none except those in full communion with the Church were permitted to be witnesses of the sacred rite. The singing of hymns is not mentioned by Justin as a part of the public worship, but we know from the New Testament and other sources that this mode of devotion was not neglected by the early Christians. The character of the primitive Christian hymns will be considered in another connection.

2. Yearly Festivals. — Three yearly festivals obtained currency before the close of this period; namely, Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany. The first of these was made a subject of special prominence by the con-

[1] 1 Apol., lxvii.

troversies which sprung up as to the time of its celebration. In Rome and the churches generally of the West, one opinion prevailed; in Asia Minor, another. The point of the disagreement was this. The Asiatic Christians thought that Easter ought to be celebrated on the same day on which the paschal lamb was slain; that is, on the 14th of Nisan, let this come on whatever day of the week it might. Accordingly on the 14th of Nisan they closed the Lenten fast with the celebration of the eucharist as the Christian's paschal feast. In the West, on the other hand, it was thought that the Jewish calendar ought to be discarded, that Easter should always occur upon a Sunday, the day commemorative of Christ's resurrection; and the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox was fixed upon as the appropriate day.

The demands of the Roman bishops upon the subject were stoutly resisted by the churches of Asia Minor. The Roman practice (which was also the Alexandrian) continued, nevertheless, to gain ground, so that the Council of Nicæa in 325 felt authorized to give it the authority of law.[1]

[1] An interest in this question has been revived in recent times by attempts to show a disagreement between the custom of the churches of Asia Minor and John's Gospel, and so to discredit the genuineness of this Gospel. It is assumed that the author of the Fourth Gospel locates the Last Supper on the 13th of Nisan, that the churches of Asia Minor in their commemoration of the 14th of Nisan had reference to the Last Supper, and that consequently they had a different view of the time of that supper from that which is assigned to it by the Fourth Gospel. Now, in answer to this representation, it is to be noticed that it has very slight bearing upon the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel, even when both premises are granted. Suppose, as is assumed, that the author of the Fourth Gospel locates the Last Supper on the 13th of Nisan; suppose also that the portion of the Asiatic Church which con-

The festival of Pentecost followed Easter, extending through fifty days, marked at first by daily communion, the standing posture in prayer, and absence of fasting. Gradually the attention was centred upon the fortieth day as the day of Ascension, and the fiftieth as Pentecost proper, the other days being simply non-fast days.

The feast of Epiphany received little attention till the third century, if indeed it can be said to have been adopted at all by the Church before that century. It was a feast in honor of Christ's appearance in the world, especially of His appearance as the Messiah at His baptism, and was commonly celebrated on the 6th of January.

tinued to pay respect to the Jewish calendar wished to commemorate the Last Supper: what is the conclusion? Simply this, that the *initiation* of their custom, or at least *one notion* connected with it, was not founded upon a *close scrutiny* of John's Gospel. And this may very well have been the case. There is no reason to suppose that John, if he had any thing to do with instituting the Easter celebration, deemed the precise time of its occurrence a matter of great importance Nothing was more natural, so long as account was taken of the Jewish calendar, than to make the Christian feast to occur on the same day as the Jewish, especially as Christ was regarded as the Lamb of God, typified by the Passover lamb. The ground primarily determining the custom of celebrating the 14th of Nisan is one thing. Considerations urged in favor of the custom or notions connected with it, a generation or two after it became established, are quite another thing. John, in his administration of the Church, may have countenanced the custom, and so given an occasion to appeal to his authority, without being in any wise responsible for inferences that were drawn. Surely there is nothing here of a very formidable nature to contend with. The Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is not so ill-supported as to be endangered by a bugbear of this description If either premise is denied (and there are many scholars who challenge the one or the other), the adverse criticism is of course correspondingly weakened.

II. — ORDINANCES.

1. Baptism. — A high significance was attached to baptism in the early Church. This was due, in some degree, to the circumstances of the times, as well as to the essential importance of baptism as the seal of discipleship, and the rite of initiation into the Church of Christ. To men of heathen antecedents, baptism could appear as nothing less than the boundary-line, in crossing which they renounced all that was old or customary to them, and entered upon a life emphatically new. It signified a transition such as those nurtured in Christianity from childhood cannot easily apprehend. The rite was much the same to these early converts that it is to the Hindu convert in the present, to whom it often means death to his old ties and associations, and a life in entirely new relations. With the first growth of ceremonialism, therefore, it might be expected that an exaggerated estimate of the virtue of baptism would find place. Something of this occurred within the first period of Christian history. In the time of Tertullian, there were those whose estimate of the absolving power of baptism manifestly verged upon superstition; and the Church generally, in his day, looked upon the rite as the consummation of repentance, the seal of the remission of sins, a means of gracious benefits, as well as a sign of grace already received. At the same time, there were strong protests from men of high standing against the idea that an adult candidate could reap any substantial benefit from this rite, apart from an exercise of genuine repentance and faith.

The stress laid upon baptismal absolution led to cer-

tain practical results. Some were inclined to delay the reception or the administration of the rite. They argued, that since baptism was not to be repeated, and any grievous sin would forfeit the baptismal absolution, it was better to practise delay than to run the risk of losing so valuable a grace. It was precisely this view of the case which led Tertullian to deprecate the baptism of infants and children, and also to advise unmarried and widowed adults to defer the ordinance "until they either marry, or else be more fully strengthened for continence." [1] Another result of centring the expectation of absolution upon baptism was a special incentive toward a system of penance. Since for sins committed after baptism no sacramental cleansing was provided, it was easily argued that rigorous inflictions must be imposed upon the transgressor in order to secure the pardon of these.

The form in which baptism was administered in the early Church is not without interest as a subject of historical inquiry, but it has little to do with deciding present obligation. The essence of Christianity is not so far embraced in outward rites that one unvarying form is alone valid. As the Church of to-day is at liberty to vary from the form of church government prevalent in the first centuries, and from the manner of administering the eucharist most in vogue at that time, so it is at liberty to vary as respects the externals of baptism, only fulfilling the requirements of Christ that one should be born of water and the Spirit.

The principal evidences that the early Church baptized by sprinkling or pouring are the following: (1)

[1] De Baptismo, xviii.

The great number said to have been baptized on the Day of Pentecost; (2) occasions in apostolic history where no mention is made of leaving the house for the rite; (3) representations of Christ's baptism found in the Catacombs and ancient mosaics, which picture Him as standing in the Jordan, and having the water poured upon His head by the Baptist, also other instances of a kindred significance. "In the Roman Church, and the other churches of Italy," says Kraus, "in the third and fourth centuries, baptism was administered by a kind of union of immersion with pouring or sprinkling. The sprinkling of the head and the whole body [the candidate standing in the water] forms the main feature in the pictures at Rome."[1]

On the side of immersion the following evidences may be quoted: (1) The New-Testament description of baptism as an instrument of burial and resurrection (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12); an image, however, whose force is somewhat neutralized by the representation of baptism as an outpouring (Acts i. 5, compared with ii. 16–18). (2) The modern and long-standing practice of the Oriental and Greek Churches.[2] (3) Certain sentences in the writings of the early Fathers in which baptism is described as an immersion. One of the clearest of these is the following from Tertullian: "When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we

[1] Die Römischen Katakomben, Buch IV., cap. vi.

[2] It should be noticed that in the Coptic, Armenian, and Nestorian Churches the validity of aspersion has been recognized. (A. J. Butler, Ancient Coptic Churches, ii. 267, 268.)

disown the devil and his pomp and his angels. Hereupon we are thrice immersed (*mergitamur* or *mersitamur*), making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the gospel."[1] (4) The statement of distinguished historians, like Neander, that immersion was the prevalent mode of baptism in the early Church.[2]

A comparison of these different lines of evidence can hardly fail to suggest that diversities as to the mode of administering baptism early found place in the Church. It is, perhaps, too much to affirm that practice was uniform even through the whole of the apostolic age. It is certain that we cannot add a very long space to that age without discovering more or less of variety. Surely many of the stanchest advocates of immersion will hesitate to believe that the *triple* immersion mentioned by Tertullian was continuously and universally practised in the Church from the Day of Pentecost down to his time. There is a certain intrinsic improbability that so elaborate a rite had its origin in the days of apostolic simplicity. But if there was a departure in this respect, there may have been in other respects also.

Whether immersion was the prevalent form of baptism in the first three centuries, or not, it certainly was not regarded throughout this period as of the essence of baptism. This appears from the following statement in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles: "Now, con-

[1] De Corona, iii. Compare Adv. Prax., xxvi.; Cons. Apost., iii. 16, 17; Canones Apost., l.

[2] Various writers have concluded that the candidate was immersed in a nude state; but it is to be noticed that the evidence that is quoted belongs to a later date than the present period, Ambrose being among the earliest to whom appeal is made. It may be questioned also whether such statements upon the point as are found imply complete nudity, or the dispensing with a cincture.

cerning baptism, thus baptize ye: having first uttered all these things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in running water. But if thou hast not running water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice, into the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit." [1] The case of the *clinics*, or those baptized by sprinkling on a sick-bed, supplies equally decisive evidence. To be sure, there was more or less of objection to the clinics; but in the intelligent verdict of the Church this was based, not upon the mode, but upon the doubtful religious conditions, of their baptism. The objection was substantially the same as that which is now frequently expressed against sick-bed repentance. Thus the Council of Neo-Cæsarea (A.D. 314) objected in general to promoting clinics to the office of presbyter, for the reason that a confession of faith which is first made on a sick-bed is more likely to be the offspring of necessity than of free choice.[2] The council, however, did not assume to deny that clinic baptism is real baptism. A still more liberal verdict seems to have been rendered by Cyprian more than half a century earlier. "It ought not to trouble any one," says he, "that sick people seem to be sprinkled or affused, when they obtain the Lord's grace, when Holy Scripture speaks by the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel, and says, 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and

[1] Chap. vii.

[2] Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, § 17. The council allowed that a person so baptized might, in virtue of conspicuous zeal and faith, or by reason of the lack of others equally well fitted for the office, be made priest.

ye shall be clean.' Whence it appears that the sprinkling also of water prevails equally with the washing of salvation; and that when this is done in the Church [that is, not among schismatics and heretics], where the faith both of receiver and giver is sound, all things hold, and may be consummated and perfected by the majesty of the Lord and the truth of faith."[1] Cyprian maintains that persons so baptized are just as legitimate Christians, and just as truly partakers of the Holy Spirit, as are others, and decides that they ought not to be re-baptized. This decision has all the more weight from the fact that Cyprian insisted upon re-baptism in cases where a large portion of the Church of his day did not require it.

Other representations may also be adduced, which, if not so decisive as the above, still indicate that baptism was not strictly identified with immersion in the thought of the early Church. One such appears in the current designation of martyrdom as the baptism of blood, and in the belief that it was a perfect substitute for all other baptism. "This," says Tertullian, "is the baptism which both stands in lieu of the fontal bathing when that has not been received, and restores it when lost."[2] Cyprian speaks to the same effect, declaring that catechumens who hold the true faith, and do battle for the Church, are not deprived of the sacrament of baptism, in case of death in this standing, since they are "baptized with the most glorious and greatest baptism of blood."[3] Now, the nature of this baptism precludes all idea of immersion, and the most artificial freak of the

[1] Epist., lxxv. 12, Ad Magnum. [2] De Baptismo, xvi.
[3] Epist., lxxii. 22, Ad Jubaianum.

imagination would hardly be able to connect with it any image of immersion. The blood of a martyr might be sprinkled or poured upon his body, but that he should be actually immersed in it is simply impossible. Again, Tertullian, whatever his writings may contain in favor of immersion, speaks of sprinkling as a possible mode of consummating baptism. Referring to the supposition that the apostles in the ship, and Peter attempting to walk on the waves, were sufficiently baptized, he remarks: "It is one thing to be sprinkled (*adspergi*) or intercepted by the violence of the sea, another thing to be baptized in obedience to the discipline of religion."[1] In another instance, speaking of one disposed to shirk the hardship of the repentance which ought to precede baptism, he asks: "Who will grant you, a man of so faithless repentance, one single sprinkling (*asperginem*) of any water whatever?"[2] Finally, the selection of words to denote the rite, on the part of Tertullian and others, is highly significant. Had the earliest Fathers who wrote in the Latin language believed that immersion was an accurate and complete expression for Christian baptism, it would seem that there should have been no hesitation on their part to choose this as the standard term for the rite. Being accustomed to the verbs *mergo* and *immergo* in their mother tongue, they ought to have fixed at once upon *immersio* as being a word whose import their readers would perfectly comprehend. But what did they do? Tertullian, the oldest Christian writer of any note to use the Latin language, as a rule simply transfers the Greek word to his pages, and for baptism writes *baptismus* (occasionally *baptisma*). In

[1] De Baptismo, xii. [2] De Pœnit., vi.

his brief treatise on baptism he uses this word no less than fifty times. To be sure, the corresponding verb is with him *tinguo* rather than *baptizo;* still, he makes use of the latter, and quite as often, we should judge, as of the verb *mergo*, which is an exceptional term in his references to this sacrament. Cyprian, the next Latin writer who refers to the subject at any length, borrows, as a rule, both the Greek noun and verb, and writes *baptismus* and *baptizo.* The voice of Christian antiquity is therefore clearly against the use of the word "immersion" as an exact and adequate substitute for the word "baptism."

As respects *infant baptism*, history records nothing explicit for or against it till near the close of the second century. The language of Irenæus is thought to be indicative of its practice. "He came," he says, "to save all through means of Himself; all, I say, who through Him are born again to God, — infants and children and boys and youths and old men."[1] Since in another connection[2] he speaks of baptism as the means by which men are "born again to God," it is argued, with a fair show of probability, that in the above sentence he designed to include a reference to infant baptism. Tertullian's opposition to it but a little later shows that the baptism of infants was practised more or less in that age; while his basing of his opposition on expediency indicates that it was not thought that any absolute impropriety pertained to the rite, or that infants were from their very nature incompetent to be candidates. It seemed to him needless and ill-advised to place children in their comparative innocence under the

[1] Cont. Hær., ii. 22. 4. [2] Ibid., iii. 17. 1.

heavy responsibilities of the baptismal covenant. Cyprian, on the other hand, speaking in the name of a North African council, urged among other things the comparative innocence of children as a reason why they ought not to be refused so great a blessing as the initiatory rite of the Church and kingdom of Christ. In his view, and in that of his colleagues, baptism was evidently the common duty of parents to their newly born children.[1] Origen is a witness to the same effect from the Eastern branch of the Church. He makes several references to infant baptism in his writings, and declares its administration a matter of apostolic tradition.[2] This is a very significant testimony; for even if the grounds upon which he based his verdict were not entirely conclusive, still it is not to be thought that a man of such thorough honesty as Origen, and such general carefulness in his statement of facts, would have made this statement without very considerable grounds. He must, at least, have known that infant baptism was no innovation of his age, and had evidence that it had been practised for several generations.

As respects *re-baptism*, there seems to have been a common agreement in the Church that valid baptism was not to be repeated. The only question provoking controversy, in this relation, was whether baptism administered by heretics should be acknowledged as such, in case those baptized by such authority should apply for admission to the Catholic Church. Cyprian answered in the negative, the Roman bishop in the affirmative. Each had his following for the time being, but

[1] Epist., lviii., Ad Fidum.

[2] Comm in Epist., ad Rom., v. 9; In Lev. Hom., viii.

in the end the Roman principle gained the ascendency; and it became the policy of the Church to receive without re-baptism those who had been baptized, even though it were among heretics, according to the regular trinitarian formula. Exception, however, was made against the baptism of certain classes of heretics. Thus the Council of Nicæa pronounced the baptism administered by the followers of Paul of Samosata invalid,[1] though, according to Athanasius, these anti-trinitarians actually used the trinitarian formula.

The time for baptism was evidently, in the first stage of Christian history, immediately after conversion to the Christian faith. But, with increasing numbers and more complicated relations, the need of caution was apprehended, and a period was appointed for the instruction and proving of candidates for church-membership. The length of this varied according to place and circumstances. By the Council of Elvira, two years were prescribed to the catechumens as the term preparatory to the reception of baptism.[2] According to the Apostolic Constitutions, three years should be the regular term, though the time might be shortened for a worthy candidate.[3]

2. Confirmation. — Originally laying on of hands and anointing with oil were closely connected with baptism, and were significant of the impartation of the Holy Spirit. Gradually this ceremonial acquired the force of an independent rite, and under the name of confirmation was celebrated some time after baptism. It was not, however, till the thirteenth century that the prac-

[1] Canon 19. [2] Canon 42. [3] viii. 32.

tice of separating confirmation from baptism became universal in the Latin Church, and in the Greek Church the two remained closely associated. By the rule of the former Church, confirmation was made the prerogative of the bishop alone; in the latter, both presbyters and deacons had power to confirm.

3. THE EUCHARIST. — In the first centuries the eucharist was made a part of the regular service. It was, therefore, celebrated primarily at least once a week, and in some instances more frequently. The partaking of the elements was preceded by the kiss of brotherly love, by the presentation of the offerings of the congregation, and by prayer and thanksgiving. In the North African Church, in the time of Cyprian, even young children were permitted to taste the wine of the communion. The deacons were expected to carry the elements to those unable to meet with the congregation. Tertullian speaks of communicants reserving portions of the consecrated elements, apparently for the purpose of enjoying them in their sacramental virtue at home.[1] A mystical presence and virtue were early connected with the eucharist; but it is only by an arbitrary reading of preconceived theories into the rhetorical phrases of a few writers, that any assertion of transubstantiation or of an actual repetition of Christ's sacrifice can be found in the writings of this period. Some ill-guarded expressions may have been indulged which served in a measure as a foundation for these dogmas; but, in the light of other expressions, it may confidently be affirmed that the Church of the

[1] De Orat., xix.

first three conturies consciously entertained no such dogmas.[1]

III.—MAIN FEATURES OF CHRISTIAN LIFE.

The pen of an unknown writer of the second century has given us, in the Letter to Diognetus, the following vivid description of early Christian life: "The Christians are distinguished from other men neither by country, nor language, nor the customs which they observe. They display to us, nevertheless, a wonderful and confessedly striking method of life. They dwell in their own countries, but simply as sojourners. As citizens, they share all things with others, and yet endure all things as if foreigners. Every foreign land is to them as their native country, and every land of their birth as a land of strangers. They are in the flesh, but they do not live after the flesh. They pass their days on earth, but they are citizens of heaven. They obey the prescribed laws, and at the same time surpass the laws by their lives. They love all men, and are persecuted by all. They are insulted, and repay the insult with honor. They do good, yet are punished as evildoers. . . .

"To sum up all in one word: what the soul is in the body, that are Christians in the world. The soul is dispersed through all the members of the body, and Christians are scattered through all the cities of the

[1] Not a single one of the passages cited by Alzog proves that its author entertained the Romish dogmas. (*Kirchengeschichte*, § 92.) As near an approach as any, probably, was Cyprian's interpretation of the eucharistic sacrifice. The fuller treatment of the subject belongs to the history of doctrine.

world. The soul dwells in the body, yet is not of the body; and Christians dwell in the world, yet are not of the world. The flesh hates the soul, and wars against it, though itself suffering no injury, because it is prevented from enjoying pleasures; the world also hates the Christians, though in no wise injured, because they abjure pleasures. The soul loves the flesh that hates it, and the members; Christians likewise love those that hate them. The soul is imprisoned in the body, yet preserves that very body; and Christians are confined in the world as in a prison, and yet they are the preservers of the world. The immortal soul dwells in a mortal tabernacle; and Christians dwell as sojourners in corruptible bodies, looking for an incorruptible dwelling in the heavens. God has assigned them this illustrious position, which it were unlawful for them to forsake."[1]

This is, no doubt, somewhat of an idealization of the life of the early Christians. Due account must be made of detracting elements. There were unworthy members in the Church from the beginning. In the intervals between persecutions, worldly minded men found a place among the Christians. The ignorance and credulity of many afforded a congenial soil for the growth of superstitions. Still, the atmosphere of Christian life in the first centuries was very largely an atmosphere of spirituality and consecration. The description quoted corresponds, in no small degree, to the real position and life of the early Christians. While in the world, they were not of the world; that is, the old heathen world, with its social and moral

[1] Chaps. v., vi.

maxims and tendencies. They represented a new creation, were bearers of the principles of a new social and moral dominion.

To begin with the most outward respect, the Christians distinguished themselves by their abstinence from the pleasures and amusements which engrossed the minds of their heathen neighbors. Tertullian, indeed, speaks as though there were Christians in his day who coveted participation in certain classes of current amusements. But the Church at large looked upon such indulgence as contaminating, and especially unworthy of the Christian community in its season of solemn trial and arduous warfare. Attendance not only upon the abhorrent exhibitions of the amphitheatre, but upon the games of the circus and the plays of the theatre, was regarded as inconsistent with the Christian vocation; while a professional connection with such spectacles was counted ample cause for a refusal of all fellowship. Tertullian appeals to the tender and peaceful nature of the Holy Spirit as utterly out of harmony with the noise and passion incident to the heathen diversions, and declares that one ought not to be willing to hear what one would not be willing to speak. From this lower order of pleasures, he points to the higher ones of the Christian inheritance. "What greater pleasure," he exclaims, "than distaste of pleasure itself, than contempt of all that the world can give, than true liberty, than a pure conscience, a contented life? what nobler than to tread under foot the gods of the nations, to exorcise evil spirits, to perform cures, to seek divine revealings, to live to God? These are the pleasures, these the spectacles, that befit Christian men

—holy, everlasting, pure."[1] A like train of thought appears in a writing attributed to Cyprian. In the Scriptures, it is argued, the Christian finds an exhibition which throws all worldly display into the shade. "This is a spectacle which is beheld even when sight is lost. This is an exhibition which is given by neither prætor nor consul, but by Him who is alone and above all things, and before all things, yea, and of whom are all things, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

One of the most signal distinctions of the early Christians was their exhibition of humanitarian virtues. They gave an illustration of benevolence and brotherhood that was unknown to the classic world. We find, indeed, among the Stoics, as already noted, the conception of a universal brotherhood; but the true bond of that brotherhood was not grasped and exemplified by this or any other school of classic heathenism. Love in the Christian sense, as a heart-impelling power, carrying the affections across all bounds of class and distinctions of nationality, was a new thing in the world.

Christianity put a new estimate upon the worth of man, overthrowing the classic rule that the individual is to be estimated according to his worth to the State, and teaching that he is to be valued according to his worth in the sight of Him who created and redeemed him. The Christians started out from the principle of the essential equality of all men in the sight of God. Lactantius gave expression to a principle oft repeated in the previous centuries when he wrote: "Should any say, Are there not also among you poor and rich, ser-

[1] De Spectaculis. Compare Clement of Alexandria, Pæd., iii. 11.

vants and masters, distinctions among individuals? No: we call ourselves brethren for no other reason than that we hold ourselves all equal. For since we measure every thing human, not by its outward appearance, but by its intrinsic value, we have, notwithstanding the difference of outward relations, no slaves; but we call them brethren in the Spirit and fellow-servants in religion."[1] A very explicit statement of the same sentiment had been given by Clement of Alexandria. "Domestics," he writes, "are to be treated like ourselves; for they are human beings, as we are. For God is the same to free and bond."[2] Ignatius gives this exhortation: "Despise not slaves, either male or female."[3] "Am I a slave," says Tatian, "I endure servitude. Am I free, I do not make a vaunt of my good birth. I see that the same sun is for all, and one death for all, whether they live in pleasure or destitution."[4]

Christianity did not make direct war upon slavery as an institution, for that would have been to engage in social and political revolution at an unseasonable era. But it greatly ameliorated slavery in practice, and inculcated principles whose logical issue could be nothing less than emancipation. There is, it is true, only scanty reference to the practice of manumission before the time of Constantine; but it may be inferred that there was a growing sentiment in its favor.

In pursuance of this principle of equality, all classes received a proper share in the offices of brotherly love. The poor in each congregation were provided for by weekly contributions. The rendering of these offer-

[1] Instit. Div., v. 16.
[2] Pæd., iii. 12.
[3] Epist. ad Polycarp., iv.
[4] Orat. ad Græcos, xi.

ings, according to Irenæus, was esteemed not so much a burdensome requirement, as a free and welcome fulfilment of a high and holy vocation. "The Jews," he says, "had the tithes of their goods consecrated to Him; but those who have received liberty set aside all their possessions for the Lord's purposes, bestowing joyfully and freely, not the less valuable portions of their property, since they have the hope of better things."[1] Strangers were awarded free hospitality. From however distant a quarter a brother might come, he had only to show a certificate from his bishop to secure attention to his wants. Duties of hospitality and charity were made by Tertullian a strong argument against mixed marriages. "Who [being a heathen]," he asks, "would suffer his wife, for the sake of visiting the brethren, to go round from street to street to other men's, and indeed to all the poorer cottages? Who will suffer her to creep into prison to kiss a martyr's bonds? If a pilgrim brother arrive, what hospitality for him in an alien home? If bounty is to be distributed to any, the granaries, the storehouses, are foreclosed."[2] One reason for fasting, as regarded by Hermas, was the saving of means which might be bestowed upon "a widow or an orphan, or some person in want."[3] For the same

[1] Cont. Hær., iv. 18. 2. It should be noticed, however, that the spontaneous character of Christian giving was not kept up to its proper standard throughout the period. With Cyprian and Origen we find a disposition to favor the Jewish idea of the binding obligation of tithes. At the same time, there was a more serious deterioration, in that the relief of the recipient was no longer made the sole consideration, and almsgiving was held up as a work of merit, a means of special benefits to the giver. See Uhlhorn, Christian Charity in the Early Church.

[2] Ad Uxorem, ii. 4.

[3] Simil., v. 3. Compare Origen, Hom. in Lev., x.

end, Clement of Alexandria inculcated plainness of dress. While Christian simplicity, he argues, inculcates that "our life ought to be any thing rather than a pageant," Christian charity is likewise positive in its prohibition of needless display. "It is monstrous for one to live in luxury while many are in want. How much more glorious is it to do good to many than to live sumptuously! How much wiser to spend money on human beings than on jewels and gold! How much more useful to acquire decorous friends than lifeless ornaments!"[1]

The strong contrast between the Christians and the heathen, in respect of the offices of brotherly love, was strikingly exhibited amid the ravages of a pestilence in Carthage and in Alexandria. While the latter deserted their sick friends and left the dead unburied, the former cared for their plague-stricken brethren with all tenderness, and paid due respect to the remains of the dead. At the same time an illustration was given of how easy it was for Christian benevolence to overflow the bounds of the Church. Cyprian exhorted his people to extend their ministrations to their heathen neighbors, reminding them, that as children of God they ought to imitate that divine clemency which bestows blessings upon the just and upon the unjust.[2]

Another marked application of Christian principles appeared in the domestic field. We find, it is true, the beginnings of that abnormal asceticism which finally culminated in monastic extremes. The feeling of dual-

[1] Præd., ii. 13.

[2] Life of Cyprian by Pontius. Compare the language of Dionysius of Alexandria in Eusebius, vii. 22.

ism so strongly characteristic of the age came, in spite of theoretical inconsistency, to influence in a measure the thought and practice of the Church. "The heathen Gnostic principle," says Schaff, "of separation from the world and from the body as a means of self-redemption, after being theoretically exterminated, stole into the Church by a back-door of practice, directly in face of the Christian doctrine of the high destiny of the body and perfect redemption through Christ."[1] This growing tendency toward asceticism naturally affected the conception of marriage. Before the end of the second century a strong prejudice had arisen against second marriages. This, however, may have been due in the first instance to a desire to emphasize the sacredness of the marriage relation, rather than to any contrary motive. It was helped on also by a very natural disposition to regard as a proper ideal for the laity the same restraint which a current interpretation of 1 Tim. iii. 2 imposed upon the clergy, this passage being thought to prohibit second marriages.[2] From this objection to a renewal of the conjugal relation, some went on to a species of disparagement even of a first marriage, at least to the extent of praising the superior virtue of the virginal state. As early a writer as Athenagoras not only reprobates second marriage as a "specious adultery," but bestows a special commendation upon those who choose the unmarried state as a means of living in closer communion with God.[3] A similar exaltation of virginity appears with Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen. Their theoretical preference on this point, however, is not to

[1] Church History, ii. § 105. [2] Origen, Cont. Celsum., iii. 48.
[3] Legat., xxxiii.

be overestimated. They did not question the propriety of marriage: that extreme was left to the heretics. It was not till the latter part of the period, that the right even of the clergy to marry began to be seriously questioned. As already indicated, the first synodal restriction in this direction, that is on record, came from the Council of Elvira. This was only a provincial council, and adopted a rigor that was not yet insisted upon by the entire Church.

As respects Christians generally, no more radical principle found acceptance in the Church than appears in the following utterance of Tertullian: "There is no place at all where we read that nuptials are prohibited, of course on the ground that they are a 'good thing.' What, however, is *better* than this 'good,' we learn from the apostle, who *permits* marrying indeed, but *prefers* abstinence."[1] And even this much of preference would seem not to have been universally entertained at the close of the second century. At least, we find Clement of Alexandria giving his preference to the man who enters into family relations, and makes a good use of the discipline which they impose. Speaking of the true Gnostic, or the ideal Christian, he says, "He eats and drinks and marries, not as principal ends of existence, but as necessary. I name marriage even, if the Word prescribe, and as is suitable. For having become perfect, he has the apostles for examples. And one is not really shown to be a man in the choice of a single life; but he surpasses men, who, disciplined by marriage, procreation of children, and care for the house, without pleasure or pain, in his solicitude for the house, has been

[1] Ad Uxorem, i. 3.

inseparable from God's love, and withstood all temptation arising through children and wife and domestics and possessions."[1] It is to be noted also that those who exalted the virginal above the married state intended by this verdict no disparagement of woman. The basis of their preference for the single life was its freedom from distraction, and also the idea that fleshly indulgence was opposed to the greatest advance in holiness.

If monastic tendencies encouraged a special praise of virginity, there were at the same time in the Church those high ideas of marriage which ultimately assigned to it the character of a sacrament. Such aberrations on the side of ascetic theories, as have been noted, by no means prevented a beautiful ideal of home life from being commonly entertained. In fine, it was a positive and glorious regeneration which Christianity wrought in the domestic sphere. It raised woman from a position of comparative slavery to a position of dignity, sanctity, and comparative equality. The words of an ancient formula for the initiation of a deaconess, "Thou didst not disdain that thy only begotten Son should be born of a woman,"[2] are one among many significant indications of a transformed estimate of woman's position. She was regarded as a candidate for the same spiritual ideal as man. "In this perfection," wrote Clement of Alexandria, "it is possible for man and woman equally to share."[3] Childhood received in like manner an augmented sanctity and importance, and the abuses of the parental relation current among the heathen are mentioned by the early Christian writers

[1] Strom., vii. 12. [2] Const. Apost., viii. 20. [3] Strom., iv. 19.

only with abhorrence. The bonds of family were regarded as cemented and sanctified by the common relations of its members to the same God and Saviour. "We must regard the woman's crown," says Clement of Alexandria, "to be her husband, and the husband's crown to be marriage, and the flowers of marriage the children of both. The glory of children is their fathers, and our glory is the Father of all, and the crown of the whole Church is Christ."[1] "Whence are we to find words enough," asks Tertullian, "to tell the happiness of that marriage which the Church cements, and the oblation confirms, and the benediction signs and seals; which the angels report back to heaven, which the Father holds for ratified? What kind of a yoke is that of two believers of one hope, one desire, one discipline, one and the same service? Both brethren, both fellow-servants; no difference of spirit or of flesh. Together they pray, together prostrate themselves, together perform their fasts; mutually teaching, mutually exhorting, mutually sustaining."[2] As Tertullian's description indicates, the home was counted a sanctuary, and united worship of its inmates one of the great privileges of the home life. Tertullian even lays down the rule, that a Christian brother who has chanced to call ought not to be dismissed from the house without prayer.[3]

Christianity gave also to labor a new sanctity. The old theory that manual toil was unworthy of a freeman was cast aside. This was a great stride forward. Indeed, St. Paul's principle, that, "if a man work not, neither shall he eat" (2 Thess. iii. 10), was really the

[1] Pæd., ii. 8. [2] Ad Uxorem, ii. 8. [3] De Orat., xxvi.

corner-stone of a new civilization. It involved conditions essential to Christian democracy and brotherhood. In the theory of Christians, the dignity of labor found a hearty acceptance. With the lives of their illustrious leaders before them, they could not do otherwise than honor all honest employment. Hence, the Apostolic Constitutions points to the example of the apostles, who labored as tent-makers, fishermen, and husbandmen, and exhorts to labor, saying, "The Lord our God hates the slothful."[1]

Finally, we may mention, as characteristic of early Christianity in the sphere of life and practice, the cheerful and hopeful temper which it breathed into its adherents. A line of sombre hue began indeed to be drawn across that life by the asceticism which, from the rise of Montanism, made increasing progress in the Church. There was a tendency thereafter to put a greater discount upon the natural order of things, than is in harmony with the spirit of the New Testament. One manifestation of this was in the imposition of fasts.[2] But even back of this asceticism there was a freshness and enthusiasm which tempered the element of gloom in it; and taking Christian life as a whole, in the first three centuries, it was peculiarly buoyant, cheerful, and hopeful. There was a sense of enrichment at the hands of Christ, and an expectancy of eternal fruition.

[1] ii. 63.

[2] "In the time of Tertullian," says Pressensé, "the Church still used large liberty in this respect. There was no compulsory fast, except that of the great Easter week, on the night commemorative of the entombment of Christ. The rules for fasting, however, were soon multiplied: and the custom of observing as days of vigil the Wednesday and Friday in each week, in memory of the Passion, became more and more general." (See Tertullian, De Jejun., ii.)

which in a marked degree conquered adversity and banished heaviness of heart. Many a convert from the darkness and emptiness of paganism could enter heartily into the triumphant refrain of Clement of Alexandria: "He hath changed sunset into sunrise, and through the cross brought death to life; and, having wrenched man from destruction, He hath raised him to the skies, transplanting mortality into immortality, and translating earth to heaven."[1] Joy was considered not only the birthright, but the duty, of Christians. "Remove grief from you," says the Pastor of Hermas, "and crush not the Holy Spirit which dwells in you. For the Spirit of God which has been granted to us to dwell in this body does not endure grief or straitness. Wherefore put on cheerfulness, which always is agreeable and acceptable to God."[2] Nor was it merely while looking at the life beyond that the eyes of Christians were able to discern brightness. They dwelt, no doubt, mainly upon God's supernatural order; but they were not by any means wholly blinded to the revelation of God in nature. We find, for example, Clement of Rome, indulging a glowing description of the Divine harmony and beneficence stamped upon nature.[3] The regular worship also of the Christian congregations paid tribute to God as the God of nature. "The eucharistic prayer never fails to unite in one act of thanksgiving both the natural and supernatural gifts of God, — the bountiful providence which makes the harvest ripen, and the gracious forgiveness with which the prodigal is welcomed home."[4]

[1] Cohort., xi. [2] Command, x. 2. [3] Epist. ad Corinth., xx.
[4] Pressensé, Christian Life, Book II., chap. i.

IV. — THE CATACOMBS, AND THEIR TESTIMONY ON CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THOUGHT.

De Rossi, a leading investigator of the Catacombs in recent times, finds good evidence that at least three or four of them were commenced within the first century; and Christian burial-places of this kind were probably preceded by Jewish. Their chief, if not their sole, design at first was to provide suitable resting-places for the bodies of the dead. This was the original aim in their excavation. The old theory that they were deserted quarries or sand-pits, which the Christians appropriated, is untenable, being clearly contradicted by the structure, of which narrow corridors and sharp angles are characteristic features. It is also a mistake to suppose that primarily the use of the catacombs as places of refuge was an influential motive in their construction. The attempt at secrecy in their structure did not become prominent till in the third century. This was clearly the case with the Roman Catacombs. "They were, like the pagan tombs, situated on the high roads entering the city. Their entrances were frequently protected and adorned by elegant structures of masonry, such as that which is still visible at the Catacomb of St. Domitilla."[1] So far as the mere purpose of burial was concerned, these cemeteries could claim the protection of that respect which classic antiquity generally awarded to the resting-places of the dead. The decrees that were finally issued against visiting them (such as the Valerian edict in 257) had probably more

[1] W. H. Withrow, The Catacombs of Rome, Book I., chap. ii.

reference to their use as assembling-places than as mere burial-places.

The earliest catacombs were most likely of private origin. Wealthy Christians could easily be constrained to offer the family sepulchres upon their own grounds for the burial of distinguished martyrs, as also of the poor. Thus burial centres were established, about which catacombs, of greater or less extent, were formed in process of time. It is hardly to be doubted, also, that the Christians soon formed burial associations among themselves. Great tolerance was awarded to this kind of association. Preserved documents show that a great number of burial societies, representing different trades and professions, existed at Rome. An assessment upon the members of these provided for the necessary expenses. There are indications that the very extensive Catacomb of St. Callistus was under the charge of the Roman Church, and was recognized by the government as the cemetery of a burial association.[1]

The largest and most noteworthy of the catacombs are found near the great roads leading from Rome, and within three miles of the walls.[2] Their entrance at present, when not through the crypt of an ancient church, is by a descending stairway through an aperture or archway. They consist essentially of narrow corridors, with an occasional addition of a small chamber, built in a friable, volcanic formation, the *tufa granolare*. The corridors range from two to five feet in width,

[1] Hippolytus, Philos., ix. 7.

[2] Catacombs are found in many other places, those at Naples being among the most important. Victor Schultze gives a list of thirteen places in the Orient, and thirty-three in the West, that have catacombs (*Die Katakomben*, p. 25.)

intersect each other for the most part nearly at right angles, are usually vaulted and naked, but are occasionally plastered or supported by masonry. Graves, cut into the sides and sealed up with slabs of marble or other material, thickly line these narrow ways, which are themselves very numerous, and arranged in line would extend hundreds of miles. Michele de Rossi[1] estimates that those of St. Callistus, the largest catacomb, would extend about the whole length of Italy. The same author computes that the Roman Catacombs, with the compact style of burial employed, contain room enough for nearly four millions of bodies. To economize space more perfectly, the galleries were sometimes arranged upon different planes, one below the other. In individual instances, there are as many as five stories in a catacomb. The chambers are small, vaulted rooms, often not more than eight or ten feet square. These, if not simply burial chambers, may have been used for the celebration of funeral services, and for the administration of the eucharist near the graves of the martyrs.

The accession of Constantine, with its addition of security and enlarged resources to the Church, lessened the motive for the use of underground cemeteries. Still, for a considerable interval, burials in these continued to be in the majority. After the year 373, however, the inclination toward this kind of interment rapidly decreased; and, according to Kraus, the year 454 marks the last instance in which a body was consigned to a catacomb.[2] Thereafter these resting-places of the dead

[1] Brother of the chief investigator, Giovanni Battista de Rossi.
[2] Die Römischen Katakomben, Buch II., kap. iii.

were used as chapels and pilgrim resorts. Meanwhile, a work of spoliation or depletion was begun, first at the hands of barbarian invaders, and then at the hands of the authorities of the Church, who sought to secure relics by depositing them within the walls of the city. A great number of bodies were transferred; an inscription records the translation, by Pope Paschal I., of twenty-three hundred on a single day of the year 817. During the Middle Ages, the Catacombs fell into neglect, and became largely lost to knowledge. In the sixteenth and the following centuries some progress was made toward rediscovery and description; but it was reserved for De Rossi and his co-laborers, in the last few decades, to bring the crowning investigations to the subject.

Among the objects of interest in the Catacombs, are symbols and symbolical paintings; various works of art, including gilt glasses, different styles of lamps, terra-cotta vases, children's toys, occasional specimens of sculpture; sepulchral inscriptions. The principal symbols are the anchor, the ship, the palm, the crown, the dove, the olive-branch, the peacock, and the phœnix as significant of immortality, the shepherd, the lamb, the fish, and the cross. Dear as was this last symbol to the hearts of Christians, it is not of frequent occurrence in the Catacombs, and, moreover, appears usually in some disguised form, inasmuch as it was peculiarly exposed to heathen scorn. The fish is an oft-recurring symbol, and seems to have had a very full import to the early Christians. It is highly probable that it embraced the meaning of the letters in the Greek word for fish, these letters being used as initials of the following titles

of the Redeemer, *Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour.* It may also have had some connection with baptism, or with the vocation of Christ's ambassadors as "fishers of men." Sometimes it appears in conjunction with bread and wine, in which case it has reference to the heavenly food which Christ supplies, or to the eucharist.

The pictures in the Catacombs show considerable dependence upon classic art, but also exhibit abundant traces of the marked influence of the new religion. A noticeable feature is the absence of sorrowful representations. The crucifixion of Christ nowhere appears among the pictures of the first three centuries. Within the same period, only a single portrayal of Christian martyrdom has been identified with a good degree of probability; and this enters into no incidents of torture and suffering, simply representing two confessors standing before their judge, and the retreating form of the heathen priest who served as their accuser.[1]

Many of the inscriptions are very brief expressions of domestic affection or of Christian hope and confidence. The following may serve as examples: "To Libera Maximilla, a most loving wife. She lived in peace." "To the well-deserving Silvana, who sleeps here in peace." "Aurelia, our very sweet daughter, who retired from the world, Severus and Quintus being consuls." "To the highly venerable, most devout, and very sweet father, Secundus. His wife and sons, in expression of their dutifulness, have placed this slab." "Laurentius was born into eternity in the twentieth year of his age. He sleeps in peace."

The evidence supplied by the inscriptions and repre-

[1] Kraus, Buch IV., kap. v.

sentations in the Catacombs is somewhat qualified by the paucity of dates. The proportion of dated inscriptions is quite small. The characteristics of these, however, furnish a basis for an approximate determination of the age of many others. Allowing a sufficient margin for the element of chronological uncertainty, we may still derive important information as respects the life and belief of the early Christians. No doubt the theological literature of the period abounds much more in explicit statements upon doctrinal points than do these monumental remains; nevertheless, the latter make a valuable supplement to the former, and have the special advantage of being unstudied expressions of what was commonly in the hearts of Christians. "The voice we hear is not that of a bishop or doctor speaking *ex cathedra*, but the voice of Martha and Mary by the grave of Lazarus, pouring forth at once their sorrow and their hope." [1]

1. The Catacombs bespeak a genuine recognition of the principles of Christian brotherhood and equality. Not only are titles of nobility wanting: there is scarcely a record of the distinction between master and slave.

2. The Catacombs, as a whole, testify to a very high appreciation of the gospel virtues on the part of the early Church. Such graces as humility, gentleness, sympathy, and self-renunciation are here commended as highest ornaments of character.

3. The Catacombs testify to the joyful faith of the Church, its living and inspiring belief in the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. "The glorious doctrine of the resurrection was everywhere

[1] Pressensé, Christian Life, Book III., chap. vii.

recorded. It was symbolized in the ever recurring representations of the story of Jonah, and of the raising of Lazarus, and was strongly asserted in numerous inscriptions. As the early Christians laid the remains of the departed saint in their last long rest, the sacred words of the gospel, 'I am the resurrection and the life,' must have echoed with a strange power through the long corridors of that silent city of the dead, and have filled the hearts of believers, though surrounded by the evidences of their mortality, with an exultant thrill of triumph over death and the grave. This was a recompense for all their pains."[1]

4. The Catacombs witness to the central place of Christ in the faith and hopes of the early Church, and to the recognition of His divinity. His name appears distinctly combined with that of Deity in such expressions as, "God, the Lord Christ;" "God Christ Almighty;" "God, holy Christ, only light;" "To Christ, the one holy God."

5. The Catacombs witness to the freedom of the early Church from any idolatrous veneration of the Virgin Mary. There is no apparent attempt to exalt her above the place which would naturally and necessarily be assigned to her in a full list of biblical representations. "In those earliest decorations of the Catacombs," says Marriott, "which De Rossi and other Roman antiquaries believe to be before the age of Constantine, representations of the Virgin Mary occur only in such connection as is directly suggested by Holy Scripture."[2] To be sure, there is a class of figures in the

[1] Withrow, Book III., chap. ii.

[2] The Testimony of the Catacombs and other Monuments of Christian Art.

attitude of prayer, the so-called *oranti*, that appear to Romish eyes to represent the Virgin in her office of intercession. But there is no proper ground for such an identification. Some of the praying figures are males, some in the garb of children and youths, — facts strongly favoring the conclusion that they were designed simply as memorials of the pious dead. Moreover, if a different application were to be assigned any of them, it would be quite as probable that they were intended to serve as symbols of the Church, as that they were meant to image the Virgin. Kraus, writing from the Romish stand-point, says, "We see the Church or the Virgin in these *oranti*, and, indeed, in most cases the latter rather than the former."[1] A principal ground alleged for this verdict is, that female figures in the same attitude appear upon gilt glasses in connection with inscriptions which identify them with the Virgin. But there is no certainty that these glasses originated before the age of Constantine; and if they originated after that era, which marked a powerful acceleration of every tendency to exalt the Virgin, they are explained by the new conditions, and help very little toward deciding the intent of the primitive *oranti*. In the opinion of Marriott, the gilt glasses which present Mary in the form of an *orante* were not earlier than the fifth century.[2] It might, however, be allowed that she was portrayed on this wise in the pre-Constantinian era, without thereby proving the existence within that era of the Romish theory and practice. To represent Mary under a form that was also applied to the commemoration of

[1] Buch. IV., kap. v.

[2] Schultze is pronounced for the same conclusion.

ordinary Christian women, is vastly different from portraying her as the crowned queen of heaven. There is nothing definite in the monuments in favor of mariolatry; and since the whole literature of the first three centuries is destitute of any evidence on the side of this form of idolatry, no indefinite monumental representation is to be warped into an indication of such idolatry within those centuries.

6. The Catacombs witness rather against than for the doctrine of purgatory. There is no such catalogue of petitions for the departed as might be expected to have sprung from any clear recognition of such a doctrine. The prayers recorded to have been sent after the dead, and in their behalf, are simply the spontaneous outbreathings of affection, such as might naturally be uttered apart from any theory of their special needfulness; prayers of sweet confidence and joyful hope, rather than anxious supplications for the relief of friends from a torturing purgatory.

7. The Catacombs in no wise disagree with the evidence supplied by patristic literature, that the custom of addressing prayers to the saints was not in vogue before the fourth century. That some brief petitions or ascriptions to the departed should be found only accords with the fact that many of the inscriptions belong to a later period. One of these, pertaining to the year 380, contains the cry of an orphaned girl for parental remembrance. A few undated inscriptions of similar import are found; but it remains to be proved that they were pre-Constantinian, and, if so, that they represent a custom.[1]

[1] Schultze says this class of inscriptions cannot be proved to be earlier than the fifth century. (Katakomben, p. 269.)

"Until the fourth century," says Pressensé, "no name of any creature, angel or saint, ever entered into the prayers of the Church."[1]

Surely it is no small distance which separates the Church of the Catacombs from the Church whose central sanctuary now overlooks the site of these ancient cemeteries. The teaching which is gathered from their symbols and inscriptions is in many points vitally contrasted with that which is published from St. Peter's and the Vatican. No doubt the papal Church surpasses the primitive Christian communion in splendor and majesty of externals; but before the mirror of Christ's teaching the more excellent glory is with the humble Church of the primitive age.

V.—MEN OF MARKED INDIVIDUALITY.

In treating of martyrs, apologists, and theologians, we have already portrayed most of the representative men of the era, as far as suits our purpose. But there are two who may well claim a somewhat fuller sketch, as being eminent exponents of peculiarly interesting types of character. We refer to Tertullian and Origen.

TERTULLIAN was born at Carthage, not far from the middle of the second century. He was the son of a centurion in the service of the proconsul. The advantages of a good education seem to have been supplied to him. He became sufficiently versed in the Greek to write treatises in that language. Eusebius speaks of him as a "man who made himself accurately ac-

[1] Christian Life, Book II., chap. iv.

quainted with the laws of the Romans."[1] This may be taken as an indication that he pursued for a time the life of an advocate. The style of his writings is also strongly suggestive of training in such a vocation. Apart from the testimony of his numerous writings to his energetic use of his pen, few definite facts are given of his life after his conversion. Jerome speaks of him as "Tertullianus presbyter," and there are some indications in his own writings that he belonged to the clergy.[2] He lived in marriage relations, and we have two letters from him addressed to his wife. His career as a Christian was divided into two sections by his espousal of Montanism; though as a Montanist he simply exhibited, in intensified form, the traits by which he had previously been characterized. Obscurity rests upon the close of his life. He probably died about the year 220.

Tertullian, no doubt, took no small element of character from the national stock. He was in native temperament a Carthaginian, filled with the ardor and passionate impulses congenial to the burning African soil. He gave his whole soul to whatever he espoused. Though we have no definite account of his conversion, we are justified in presuming that his conviction was no sooner enlisted on the Christian side than Christianity filled his whole horizon, and became the one object of his hopes and ambitions. Unreserved devotion to an object of his affection, and vehement opposition to an object of his dislike, were irrepressible tendencies of his nature. No virtue was so difficult for him to cultivate as patience. It was an oft-defeated struggle after this grace which led to his pathetic exclamation, "I, most

[1] Hist. Eccl., ii. 2. [2] De Anima, ix.

miserable, ever sick with the heats of impatience, must of necessity sigh after, and invoke, and persistently plead for, that health of patience which I possess not."[1] "To him," says Pressensé, "moderation was impossible: he went to extremes both in hatred and love, both in language and in thought; but every act and word was the result of deep conviction, and was animated by that which alone can give vitality to the efforts of any human spirit, — a sincere and earnest passion for truth. Even the excess of his vehemence gave him an element of power, for it commanded the service of a fiery eloquence. His whole character is summed up in the one word "passion," — passion made to subserve the holiest of causes, pure from all petty ambition, but constantly betraying itself into harshness and injustice toward others."[2]

This fulness of the emotive element naturally conditioned the intellectual factor in Tertullian. We should not expect to find in him great philosophical breadth or thorough intellectual consistency. "Tertullian's mind," says Neander, "had acuteness, depth, and dialectic dexterity, but no logical clearness, repose, and arrangement; it was profound and fruitful, but not harmonious; the check of sober self-government was wanting. Tertullian, though an enemy of philosophical speculation, which seemed to him to be a falsifier of the truth, was not destitute of a speculative element; but it wanted the scientific form. Feeling and imagination prevailed above the purely intellectual. An inward life, filled with Christianity, outran the development of his understanding."[3]

[1] De Patientia, i. [2] Martyrs and Apologists, Book II., chap. iii.
[3] Antignosticus, Intro.

In the style of Tertullian we see an image of the man. "It is strong, even to hardness; it is strained, incorrect, African, but irresistible. It is poured forth like lava from an inward furnace, kept ever at white heat; and the track of light it leaves is a track of fire too. The language of Tertullian is full of sharp antitheses, like those which characterize his thoughts. In every phrase one might seem to hear the sharp clash of swords that meet and cross, and the spark which dazzles us is struck from the ringing steel. Hence that incomparable eloquence, which, in spite of sophisms and exaggerated metaphors, rules us still."[1] It is, perhaps, in his Apologeticus that Tertullian's power as a writer appears at highest advantage. This is not free from the faults commonly pertaining to his style. "Nevertheless," says Pressensé, "we do not hesitate to place among the very masterpieces of the human mind this incorrect harangue, so mightily is it moved with a great impulse."

As regards the range of his thoughts and principles, Tertullian cannot be excused from the charge of a certain one-sidedness, as might be judged from the single fact of his affiliation with Montanism. He carried his supernaturalism and asceticism beyond the true mean. He crowded out, in a measure, the thought of sanctifying the world by the thought of renouncing or repudiating the world. Piety, shaped according to his model, would savor of extreme Puritanism. Still, much is to be found in his conception of Christianity that is worthy of imitation; and, as a matter of fact, Tertullian has been a powerful factor in the religious and theological world. Especially influential has been his emphasis

[1] Pressensé.

upon the practical side of Christianity. "The special claim," says Neander, "of this Father upon our attention, arises from his being the first representative of that peculiar form of the Christian and theological spirit which has prevailed in the Western Church through all successive ages, — that form in which the anthropological and soteriological element predominates. In Tertullian we find the first germ of that spirit which afterwards appeared with more refinement and purity in Augustine; as from Augustine the scholastic theology proceeded, and in him also the Reformation found its point of connection."

ORIGEN was born at Alexandria in the year 185. The character of his parents was such as to shed a sanctifying influence upon his early years. His father, Leonides, was a man of stanch and intelligent piety, and spared no pains to foster the holy flame in the heart of the thoughtful and gifted boy. Origen more than realized his best hopes; and we have the picture of the father taking such delight in the piety of the son, that betimes he would bend over his sleeping form and reverently kiss his uncovered breast, as being a sanctuary of the Spirit of God. The alert faculties of the youth were developed under the able tuition of such teachers as Pantænus and Clement. The period of youth was hardly passed before he became a teacher of others, and was compelled to shoulder the full responsibilities of manhood. In his eighteenth year, through the martyrdom of his father, — whom he exhorted to confess Christ even unto death, and was anxious himself to do likewise, — he became chargeable

with his own support and that of his mother. He resorted to teaching, beginning with lessons in grammar, but passing speedily to the presidency of the catechetical school, a perilous honor at that time. But Origen delighted in the opportunities of his position, and manifested his fearless fidelity by encouraging to the last such of his disciples as were called to the ordeal of martyrdom. Meanwhile, he spared no pains to become a master of sacred learning. That his time for his chosen studies might be increased, he sacrificed food and sleep, and lived after a pattern of extreme abstinence. To add still more to his asceticism, the enthusiasm for a theory was joined with the practical demands of his position; and he thought it incumbent upon himself to become a eunuch for the kingdom of God, an error of which he did not fail to repent in after-years. Broad-minded and intellectually daring, he resorted to the study of heathen philosophy as a preparation for defending Christianity, and did not hesitate even to attend the lectures of the Neo-Platonist philosopher Ammonius Saccas. He became a zealous student of the Hebrew, and made use of his acquaintance with the language in his extensive series of commentaries, which he commenced at the solicitation of his friends. His "De Principiis," containing a system of theology, was also sent forth among his earlier publications. Already he had reached a foremost place among Christian scholars. But at the zenith of this prosperity, adversity was prepared. Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria, became animated by an implacable opposition to Origen. Jealousy of the overshadowing reputation of the great teacher may have been among the motives of the Alex-

andrian bishop, but the immediate occasion of his persecuting policy was the irregular honors bestowed upon Origen by certain bishops of Palestine, — first, by inviting him, while yet a layman, to preach; and then ordaining him, without consultation with the Alexandrian see, to the office of presbyter. Demetrius seems to have regarded this as an unpardonable trespass against his episcopal dignity, and did not rest until he had deposed Origen from the priesthood, and excommunicated him from the church of Alexandria. The Roman church concurred in this sentence; but in Palestine and some other Eastern districts it was regarded with profound disapprobation. To avoid dissension in the Alexandrian church, Origen retired from the Egyptian metropolis. An asylum was readily afforded him in Palestine, and a large portion of his remaining years was spent in Cæsarea. Abundant employment was still found for voice and pen. Among other memorials of this period is his great apologetic work, "Contra Celsum," a reply to the attack of the heathen philosopher Celsus upon Christianity. "Written very rapidly, at the pressing instance of Ambrose, it has no regular method. Origen wished to re-write it, but time failed him. It remains, nevertheless, the masterpiece of ancient apology, for solidity of basis, vigor of argument, and breadth of eloquent exposition. The apologists of every age were to find in it an inexhaustible mine, as well as an incomparable model of that royal, moral method inagurated by St. Paul and St. John, which alone can answer its end, because it alone carries the conflict into the heart and conscience, to the very centre, that is, of the higher life in

man."[1] During the Decian persecution, Origen was made the victim of barbarous severities, being cast into a dungeon at Tyre and loaded with chains. His death, hastened by these tortures, occurred about the year 254.

As respects personal character, Origen presents us, beyond question, with a very lofty type of manhood. We see in him a nature broad, tolerant, gentle, and sincere, a nature in which composure and zeal, courage and meekness, steadfastness and self-renunciation, were united and reconciled. He disdained all artifices, desired no other weapon than the truth, and met opponents upon the open field of honest discussion. His view of life was too high that earthly fame and prosperity should beget in him any feeling of pride or self-sufficiency, and his loyalty to the same elevated standard kept him from complaint and malice under the sting of persecution. Referring to those who had cast him out of their fellowship, he said, "We ought much rather to feel pity than hatred for them, and pray for them rather than revile them. We have been called unto blessing, not unto cursing." In Origen, passion was subject to reason, and reason was under the sway of the milder principles of the gospel. He was not destitute of the element of enthusiasm, as may be judged from the powerful impression which he made upon his pupils; still, self-control appears more characteristic of him than intensity. In this, as in other respects, he stands in striking contrast with Tertullian. As Pressensé remarks, "These two men contrast with each other in every feature. On the one hand, we have a genius large and calm as a summer sea, serene

[1] Pressensé, Martyrs and Apologists, Book II., chap. ii.

in all its depth and breadth; on the other, we have a torrent foaming and eddying between narrow banks. On the one hand, we have a noble and lofty toleration, a sympathetic nature, everywhere seeking and finding allies for its cause, quick in discovering the points of contact between Christianity and all that had gone before it; on the other, a haughty intolerance, everywhere seeking and finding foes. The one interposes between hostile parties, he fulfils the part of a firm and conciliatory mediator between ancient philosophy and the gospel; the other will hear of no such reconciliation. The former takes pleasure in calm discussions, in conferences peacefully conducted, and in which mutual respect is shown; the latter will not suffer a heretic to speak, or, if he deigns to argue with him, he opens the argument with invectives."

When considering Origen, we are obliged to look for faults in the theologian rather than in the man. As a theologian, he exhibits defects just the opposite of those discovered in Tertullian; that is, he exhibits an undue *comprehension* and an undue idealism. In pursuance of the former, he included within the circle of Christian thought various items that belong outside of that circle. In pursuance of the latter, he undervalued the historical in revelation, gave too large a place to the allegorical in scriptural interpretation, and yielded a loose rein to speculation. These defects, however, while they qualify, do not cancel, the merits of his works, so amply are his speculative aberrations offset by products of profound thought and painstaking scholarship.

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY THE GREAT.

313-590.

INTRODUCTION.

In the first period, the great facts of Christian history, in the sphere of the State, were the extension of Christianity over the Roman Empire, and its peaceful, heroic resistance to the exterminating efforts of the secular power; in the sphere of doctrine, the defence of its faith against Jewish and heathen criticism, the overcoming of Jewish and Gnostic heresies, and the completion, though the condemnation of Sabellius and Paul of Samosata, of the first great stage in the trinitarian controversies; in the sphere of church constitution and discipline, the gradual development of an episcopal hierarchy, an enlarging system of rules as respects admission into the Church, and the conditions of retaining membership, and the rise of a party (the so-called Montanists) which advocated a very rigorous treatment of offenders against the sanctity of Christian fellowship; in the sphere of morals and life, the revelation of a new power to purify heart and conduct, and to ameliorate all human relations.

In the period upon which we now enter, the order of events is, in many respects, strongly contrasted with that just given. We are still confronted, it is true, with agitation and conflict. Christian history in no

century has been free from such factors. But the agitation and the conflict are now carried forward under new conditions and in new directions. From the culminating storm of heathen rage and violence in the Diocletian persecution, the Church emerges into the sunshine of imperial favor. Its servants, instead of wandering in exile, suffering in prison, being tortured, or burned at the stake, are honored guests at one of the most magnificent courts which ever shone upon Roman soil. The old conditions are reversed. Instead of haughtily denying the right of Christianity to an existence, heathenism finds its own right to an existence questioned, and is obliged to turn suppliant. Instead of reviling Christians as a kind of secret, underground association, the heathen themselves are obliged to retire from the field, until their very name, as "pagans" (villagers or countrymen), publishes their proscription and obscurity. In place of outward pressure, the Church has now to sustain the shock of violent controversies within. To the age of apology succeeds that of polemics. Instead of poverty and persecution to humble the Church, and to guard it from unworthy members, wealth and secular glory are found within its pale, with their temptations to corruption, and their tendencies to swell the list of merely nominal Christians. A far harder task is imposed than that of resisting an openly hostile world; namely, the task of subduing and sanctifying a world proffering a seductive alliance and friendship.

We have, then, the following as the distinguishing facts of the period: In the sphere of the State, the alliance of the secular government with the Church, to

the great advantage of the latter in some respects, and to its equal detriment in others; in the sphere of doctrine, a succession of heated controversies and the fixing of creeds; in the sphere of ecclesiastical constitution, an increased centralization of power in the chief episcopal centres, an advance in the direction of papal pretensions and prerogatives, and, in general, a continued development of the hierarchical system; in the sphere of morals and life, the growth of worldliness, the increasing subordination of the spiritual to the dogmatic and the ceremonial, the incorporation of heathen elements, — such, in particular, as the polytheistic tinge given to the worship, — and, finally, the spread and powerful influence of monasticism.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

SECOND PERIOD, FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY THE GREAT.

313-590.

CHAPTER I.

THE VICTORY OF CHRISTIANITY OVER HEATHENISM, AND THE ALLIANCE WITH THE STATE.

I.—THE ADMINISTRATION OF CONSTANTINE AND HIS SONS.

CONSTANTINE, a son of Constantius Chlorus, who was a Cæsar, and finally an Augustus, of the West, under the Diocletian *régime*, was about thirty years old at his father's death in 306. He had already distinguished himself by military service under Diocletian, and was well qualified to accept the honor which the dying words of his father, in the pretorium of York, and the voice of the troops, imposed upon him, in calling him to assume the imperial purple. Having ruled over Britain, Gaul, and Spain for several years, Constantine finally, in 312, brought the whole of the West under his sceptre by the overthrow of his colleague and rival Maxentius, whose intended attack upon himself he

anticipated with great energy and daring. As already stated, in January, 313, he published from Milan, in conjunction with his Eastern colleague Licinius, the famous edict of toleration.

The motives by which Constantine was actuated in siding with Christianity have been variously defined. Gibbon intimates his belief that he was moved at first almost entirely by considerations of policy, though at a later date his convictions were truly enlisted for the religion which claimed his outward support. "Personal interest," he says, "is often the standard of our belief as well as of our practice; and the same motives of temporal advantage which might influence the public conduct and professions of Constantine would insensibly dispose his mind to embrace a religion so propitious to his fame and fortunes."[1] A more probable conclusion is, that a good measure of conviction was from the first united with policy in determining his course. Even before his campaign against Maxentius, causes were at work that were well calculated to recommend the claims of the Christian faith. His father was no zealot for the common heathenism, and treated the Christians with clemency and consideration. Eusebius speaks of him as "acknowledging the Supreme God alone, and condemning the polytheism of the impious;"[2] and the historian Socrates likewise states that Constantius "had renounced the idolatrous worship of the Greeks."[3] Very likely these statements are overdrawn. The supposition which seems most credible is, that his faith was an eclectic system, which, while accepting the heathen deities (and possibly ranking Christ alongside of them), still

[1] Chap. xx. [2] Vita Constantini, i. 17. [3] Hist. Eccl., i. 2.

acknowledged, much in the sense of Neo-Platonism, a supreme Deity above all these. In any case, Constantius was liberal toward Christianity, and his attitude would not be without its influence upon the mind of his son. A still further incentive in the same direction was supplied by the experience and observation of Constantine himself. As a resident at the court of Diocletian and of Galerius, he saw the outbreak of the great persecution. Its atrocities may have revolted his mind; in any case, its issue taught him that it was no easy task to conquer Christianity. The good fortune of his father, and the miserable end of the champions of heathenism, could hardly fail to incite him to the belief that a powerful Providence was on the side of the Christians. His mind was thus rendered receptive for any new and striking evidence that might appear. In the image of the cross which flamed out of the sky, and the ensuing victory over Maxentius, this evidence was supplied.

Eusebius is our chief voucher for the assumed miracle which published to Constantine and his army the divine truth of Christianity. Lactantius is the only Christian writer beside, among the contemporaries of Constantine, from whom we have a statement bearing upon the event; and he remarks simply, that "Constantine was directed in a *dream* to cause *the heavenly sign*[1] to be delineated on the shields of his soldiers, and so to proceed to battle."[2] According to the account of Eusebius, the portent came in answer to the prayer of Constantine. Realizing the extreme hazard of his expe-

[1] That is, the initial letters of the Greek name of Christ, X and P, arranged thus, ☧ . [2] De Mortibus Persecutorum, xliv.

dition, he was made deeply conscious of his need of the aid of some higher power, but was somewhat in doubt as to what power he should address. At length it occurred to him that he could most fitly make his appeal to the Supreme Deity, the God who had so prospered his father. "He therefore called on Him," says the historian, "with earnest prayer and supplications that He would reveal to him who He was, and stretch forth His right hand to help him in his present difficulties. And while he was thus praying with fervent entreaty, a most marvellous sign appeared to him from heaven, the account of which it might have been difficult to receive with credit, had it been related by any other person. But since the victorious Emperor himself long afterward declared it to the writer of this history, when he was honored with his acquaintance and society, and confirmed his statement by an oath, who could hesitate to accredit the relation, especially since the testimony of aftertime has established its truth? He said that about mid-day, when the sun was beginning to decline, he saw with his eyes the trophy of a cross of light in the heavens, above the sun, and bearing the inscription, *By this conquer.* At this sight he himself was struck with amazement, and his whole army also, which happened to be following him on some expedition, and witnessed the miracle. He said, moreover, that he doubted within himself what the import of this apparition could be. And while he continued to ponder and reason on its meaning, night imperceptibly drew on; and in his sleep the Christ of God appeared to him with the same sign which he had seen in the heavens, and commanded him to procure a standard made in the likeness of that sign,

and to use it as a safeguard in all engagements with his enemies."[1] Constantine was careful to follow these directions. A spear, with a transverse piece from which a streamer of purple cloth was suspended, having been overlaid with gold, and surmounted by a crown containing the first two letters of the name of Christ, was, by his order, made the standard of the army; and his confidence was at the same time rewarded and strengthened by the complete victory which followed.

A degree of scepticism may well be entertained with reference to this interesting narrative. Eusebius betrays an exceedingly rhetorical vein in his "Life of Constantine," and may unconsciously have embellished the facts reported to him by the Emperor, and have given too lively a coloring to some items. Constantine himself also, without any intention to deceive, may have failed of strict accuracy. We may suppose, for example, that the "inscription" was originally a factor in the dream of the night, rather than in the open vision of the day. Still, there is no proper ground for denying all basis to the account. That Constantine appealed to the higher powers, that he observed some solar phenomenon which he took to be the cross symbol, that he had a dream in the night of corresponding significance, — these are things against whose occurrence there is no occasion to urge any objection whatever. The facts are one thing; Constantine's interpretation of them is another thing. It is by no means certain that we have to

[1] Vita Cons., i. 27-29. Compare Socrates, Hist. Eccl., i. 2. Sozomen supplies to the story a special embellishment; namely, an appearance of angels, who directed Constantine to conquer by the holy sign. (*Hist. Eccl.*, i. 3.)

deal here with a supernatural manifestation. Some of the items described as matter of divine communication are clearly out of harmony with the spirit and principles of Christianity. Who can imagine the Prince of peace commanding the emblem of His passion to be used as a standard of war, and carried at the head of legions devoted to the work of carnage and slaughter?

Constantine, from this time, was an adherent of Christianity, though by no means an adherent of the most intelligent and spiritual type.[1] He employed, however, much prudence and caution in his relation to heathenism. A sudden and violent rupture was avoided. The pagan population of Rome was gratified by a restoration of their temples at the hands of the conqueror. The old pagan dignity of Pontifex Maximus was retained (and indeed was not declined by any of the Christian emperors before the accession of Gratian). Professed heathen were still found at court, and were allowed to occupy positions of trust. Still, Constantine did not delay to bestow tokens of his superior favor upon the Christian Church. In the years which preceded his rise to the position of sole ruler over the whole Empire, he issued decrees decidedly favorable to the Christian cause. The clergy were released from the burdensome and unwelcome obligation of serving as municipal magistrates. Full liberty was granted to the bestowing of property, by testament, upon the institutions of the

[1] The account of the heathen historian Zosimus, Hist., ii. 29, that Constantine forsook heathenism because its ministers declared that it had no purification for his enormous crimes, and went over to Christianity as offering an easy purgation, needs no comment. The crimes which Zosimus specifies did not occur till long after Constantine had become the patron of Christianity.

Church. The manumission of slaves was allowed to take place in the churches. Secular business upon Sunday was prohibited in the cities (321); though a heathen rather than a Christian aspect was given to the decree, by styling the day the sacred day of the sun, instead of the Lord's day. The discrimination against the unmarried was removed. Large donations were made to the clergy in North Africa. A Christian education was provided for the Emperor's children; his eldest son, Crispus, was placed under the tuition of Lactantius.

In proportion as Constantine evinced his friendship toward Christianity, Licinius, who was governing the eastern section of the Empire, assumed an attitude of hostility; his feelings of political rivalry naturally alienating him from the party that was so closely associated with his imperial competitor. Persecution, after the violent type of the preceding age, does not appear to have entered into his plan. But he discriminated in a vexatious way against the Christians, withholding all high office from those who would not sacrifice to the gods, prohibiting the bishops from assembling in synods, closing certain churches, and forbidding the congregations of Nicomedia, where he resided, to assemble within the walls, on the sarcastic plea that the fresh air of the open country would be healthier for their assemblies.[1]

This growing divergence, in respect of religious policy, prophesied war between the two Emperors, — a war based on religious as well as on political issues. The outbreak came in the year 323. If Eusebius may be trusted, Licinius himself took pains to publish the religious cast of the conflict. After reminding his soldiers

[1] Euseb., Vita Cons., i. 50-54.

of the obligations which they owed to the religion of their ancestors, and commenting on the wickedness and folly of his adversaries in going after a strange Deity, he stated the issue as follows: "The present occasion shall prove which of us is mistaken in his judgment, and shall decide between our gods and those whom our adversaries profess to honor. Suppose, then, this strange God, whom we now regard with contempt, should really prove victorious; then, indeed, we must acknowledge and give Him honor, and so bid a long farewell to those for whom we light our tapers in vain. But if our gods triumph (and of this there can be no real doubt), then, as soon as we have secured the present victory, let us prosecute the war without delay against these despisers of the gods."[1]

After such an inauguration of the war, the utter defeat of Licinius must have seemed to the heathen themselves a divine judgment against their cause. Multitudes flocked to the churches; the ranks of the catechumens were filled to overflowing. Constantine now felt authorized to assume a more decided position. Compulsion was indeed avoided, but the whole weight of his influence was thrown against heathenism. "Let no one," he wrote, "molest another in this matter, but let every one be free to follow the bias of his own mind. With regard to those who will hold themselves aloof from us, let them have, if they please, their temples of lies: we have the glorious edifice of Thy truth which Thou hast given us as our home. We pray, however, that they may receive the same blessing."[2] This sounds as if Constantine was resolved to trust wholly to per-

[1] Vita Cons., ii. 5. [2] Ibid., ii. 56.

sonal influence in his attempts to limit heathenism. But he went beyond this, and applied the force of law to a certain extent. Officials were forbidden to offer sacrifices, such as had formerly been expected of those in their position. Certain temples dedicated to disgraceful rites, such as the temples of Venus at Aphaca and Heliopolis, were commanded to be destroyed. The impure and occult arts of divination were proscribed. Whether Constantine issued any more radical decrees than these is a disputed question. Eusebius [1] and Sozomen [2] would have us to believe that he finally sent forth a sweeping prohibition of all idolatrous sacrifices; and their statement is supported by the fact that Constantius assumed, in issuing an edict of this nature, that he was only repeating what had already been decreed by his father. On the other hand, the heathen rhetorician, Libanius, indicates that the temples were open for undisturbed worship during the whole reign of Constantine.[3] If, therefore, the edict was ever issued by the first Christian Emperor, it would seem that no earnest attempt was made for its execution. The limits of the crusade which he undertook in earnest against heathen sacrifices are, in all likelihood, correctly expressed by the following statement from Milman: "There were two kinds of sacrifices abolished by Constantine: (1) The private sacrifices, connected with unlawful acts of theurgy and magic; those midnight offerings to the powers of darkness, which in themselves were illegal, and led to scenes of unhallowed license. (2) Those which might be considered the State sacrifices, offered

[1] Vita Cons., iv. 23. [2] Hist. Eccl., i. 8.
[3] See Neander, Kirchengeschichte, vol. iii.

by the Emperor himself, or by his representative in his name, either in the cities or in the army."[1]

At the same time Constantine gave continued exhibitions of a zealous patronage of Christianity. The work of building churches was energetically forwarded. The Emperor is said to have made large donations to this end from his personal resources. The unsanctified zeal, which in some instances plundered heathen temples for the materials, was left unpunished.[2] Great respect was rendered to the leading representatives of the Church. Distinguished members of the clergy were made the travelling companions of the Emperor. "He added," writes Eusebius, "the sanction of his authority to the decisions of the bishops passed at their synods, and forbade the provincial governors to rescind any of their decrees; for he rated the priests of God at a higher value than any judge whatever."[3] Finally, in founding Constantinople, he provided a great capital dedicated to the Christian religion. Political motives were probably the chief incentive to this step, but his mind may not have been unmoved by the consideration that the ancient Roman capital showed so much of an inveterate preference for heathenism.

It is to be observed, however, that Constantine's favor toward the Church meant simply the befriending of the Catholic Church. The union of Christians seemed to

[1] History of Christianity to the Abolition of Paganism, Book III., chap. iv.

[2] Gibbon thinks depredations of this kind were not extensive in the reign of Constantine, not noticeably in excess of similar spoliations at the hands of rapacious heathens of previous generations. (Chap. xxii., *ad finem.*)

[3] Vita Cons., iv. 27.

him an important means of conserving the unity of the Empire. Hence, heretics and schismatics enjoyed very little favor at his hands;[1] hence, also, the attempt to harmonize theological factions, through the great council of Nicæa, and the banishing of bishops who refused to sign the creed of the council, or appeared opposed to the peace measures of the Emperor.

Although openly assuming the position of a Christian emperor, Constantine did not receive baptism till just before his death in 337. One reason for this long delay may, perhaps, be found in the following remark which he indulged as he was about to submit to the rite: "I had thought to do this in the waters of the Jordan, wherein our Saviour, for our example, is recorded to have been baptized."[2] But a more influential reason was probably a kind of superstitious estimate of baptism as a means of magical absolution, an absolution that might be received most safely near the end of life, when there was little margin left for defiling the soul with new sins. Eusebius speaks of him as "firmly believing, that, whatever sins he had committed as a mortal man, his soul would be purified from them through the efficacy of the mysterious words and the salutary waters of baptism."[3] The officiating bishop on the occasion was the Arian, or more properly the semi-Arian, Eusebius of Nicomedia, in the neighborhood of which city the Emperor was baptized. This looks as though Constantine was finally initiated into the Arian instead of

[1] In an edict to the Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, and Cataphrygians, he addresses them as haters of truth, and forbids them to meet, not merely in public, but even in private houses. (EUSEB., *Vita Cons.*, iii. 64.)

[2] Ibid., iv. 62. [3] Ibid., iv. 16.

the Catholic faith. Still, this conclusion is in no wise warranted. Constantine was never conscious of any defection from the creed of Nicæa. If he patronized some of the Arians during his later years, it was because they succeeded in making him believe that they were in harmony with the standard creed; if he persecuted some of the orthodox, it was not on account of their faith, but because he considered them guilty of mal-administration, or of an unreasonable obstinacy, to the detriment of the peace of the Church. "The credulous monarch," says Gibbon, "unskilled in the stratagems of theological warfare, might be deceived by the modest and specious professions of the heretics, whose sentiments he never perfectly understood; and while he protected Arius, and persecuted Athanasius, he still considered the council of Nicæa as the bulwark of the Christian faith, and the peculiar glory of his own reign."[1] A similar verdict appears in the writings of historians of the fifth century. "Although this [the Nicene] doctrine," says Sozomen, "was not universally approved, no one, during the life of Constantine, had dared to reject it openly."[2] "It ought not," writes Theodoret, "to excite astonishment that Constantine was so far deceived as to send many great men into exile; for he believed the assertion of bishops, who skilfully concealed their malice under the appearance of illustrious qualities."[3]

Were we to follow the estimate of contemporaries who enjoyed the favor of Constantine, we should be obliged to rank him among the very foremost of illustrious monarchs. The astonishing transition in their

[1] Chap. xxi. [2] Hist. Eccl., iii. 1. [3] Hist. Eccl., i. 33.

estate transported not a few Christians to the point of immoderate adulation. They found themselves the friends and guests of one of the most magnificent of rulers, — a monarch of imposing person, who clothed himself in all the splendor of a Solomon, always wearing in public a jewelled diadem, and a purple or scarlet robe of silk, embroidered with pearls and flowers of gold. The temptation to violate all sober judgment in the estimate of such a benefactor was not easily resisted. We read of a Christian minister, who, at the celebration of the third decennium of the Emperor's reign, pronounced "him blessed, as having been counted worthy to hold absolute and universal empire in this life, and as being destined to share the empire of the Son of God in the world to come." Even Constantine had the good taste to reject such unbounded flattery, "and forbade the speaker to hold such language, exhorting him rather to pray earnestly in his behalf, that whether in this life or that to come he might be found worthy to be a servant of God."[1] The historian Eusebius, though he seems to have regarded the above specimen of adulation as being rather beyond the mark, did not fall much short of it himself. He speaks of Constantine as "at once a mighty luminary and a most distinct and powerful herald of genuine piety;" says that his "character shone with all the graces of religion;" and styles him such an emperor as all history records not. The less rhetorical Theodoret designates Constantine "a prince deserving of the highest praise, who, like the divine apostle, was not called by man or through man, but by God."[2] The Greek Church, in the fifth

[1] Euseb., Vita Cons., iv. 48. [2] Hist. Eccl., i. 2.

century, began to reckon him among the saints; and still in the Greek and Russian Church he is honored with the title *Isapostolos*, the "Equal of the Apostles." From the heathenism also which he helped to conquer, he received high-sounding honors; and the Roman Senate, at his death, did not hesitate to follow custom and to enroll him among the gods.

How strange the contrast between these encomiums and titles, and those dark events whose guise of tyranny is but poorly hid by the obscurity in which history has left them! Licinius, the husband of Constantia, the sister of Constantine, was put to death, in violation of a solemn pledge that his life should be spared. To be sure, there was an accusation of treasonable designs on the part of Licinius; but unproved accusations cannot count for very much under the circumstances. A few years later, Crispus, the eldest son of Constantine, a youth of high promise, amiable, martial, and enterprising, was ordered to be executed by the jealous and suspicious father. At the same time, Licinius, the son of the emperor of the same name, was sacrificed, in spite of the tears and entreaties of his widowed mother. The innocence of both of these accomplished youths is commonly regarded as beyond question. According to very full and confident testimony, the Empress Fausta, the stepmother of the murdered Crispus, was another victim. As the story goes, her machinations, in order that she might advance her own sons, had served as a chief instigation to the execution of the innocent and slandered youths; and Constantine, coming finally to understand the case, was filled with fury, and ordered her to be suffocated in an overheated bath. But Gibbon

finds something quite contradictory to this account in the references of two orations belonging to the following period. "The former celebrates the virtues, the beauty, and the fortune of the Empress Fausta, the daughter, wife, sister, and mother of so many princes. The latter asserts, in explicit terms, that the mother of the younger Constantine, who was slain three years after his father's death, survived to weep over the fate of her son. Notwithstanding the positive testimony of several writers of the pagan as well as of the Christian religion, there may still remain some reason to believe, or at least to suspect, that Fausta escaped the blind and suspicious cruelty of her husband."[1] An astonishing list of deeds, certainly, for a saint and an Isapostolos! As a man, and a professed Christian, Constantine was not, indeed, without his merits. "From his earliest youth to a very advanced season of life, he preserved the vigor of his constitution by a strict adherence to the domestic virtues of chastity and temperance."[2] But certainly his history makes it plain, on the whole, that the first Christian emperor was quite remote from being a Christian of an enlightened and regenerate type. The stain of the purple is clearly apparent to eyes not blinded by its magnificence.

To Constantine as a general and an administrator, an eminent rank is no doubt to be assigned. "In the field," says Gibbon, "he infused his own intrepid spirit into the troops whom he conducted, with the talents of a consummate general; and to his abilities, rather than to his fortune, we may ascribe the signal victories which he obtained over the foreign and domestic foes of the

[1] Chap. xviii. [2] Ibid.

republic."[1] In his management of the State, there were, no doubt, defects. During his later years in particular, he was given to a prodigal liberality, which enriched in one direction, only to oppress in another. But, on the other hand, he gave numerous exhibitions of statesmanlike sagacity. Instances may be pointed out in which he cultivated an admirable and politic moderation. Judging him by what he accomplished, a high estimate must be placed upon his abilities; for he made himself the master of an empire in the face of formidable rivals, and carried through one of the most remarkable revolutions of history.

Upon the death of Constantine, the government of the Empire passed to his three sons, — Constantius, Constantine the Younger, and Constans; the first ruling the eastern, and the last two sharing the western division. In 340 Constantine fell in a war with Constans. This left the latter sole ruler of the West, a position which he maintained till the year 350, when he was slain in a struggle with the usurper Magnentius. The overthrow of the usurper, in 353, made Constantius master of the whole Empire.

Although Eusebius speaks of the sons of Constantine as "a trinity of pious sons, like some new reflectors of his brightness, diffusing everywhere the lustre of their father's character,"[2] it is the common verdict of historians that the government suffered a marked deterioration under the successors of the great Emperor. With

[1] Chap. xviii.

[2] So two of his statements read when combined. Vita Cons., i. 1, iv. 40.

a moral standard no higher than his, they united less ability and discretion. The first days of the new administration were stained by a cruel massacre within the collateral branches of the Constantinian family; and, though the soldiery was the instrument, there was not a little of suspicion that Constantius had a guilty responsibility in the tragedy. A pretended testament, affirming Constantine's belief that he had been poisoned by his brothers, was the excuse that was pleaded for the bloodshed.

An increase of severity toward heathenism marked the administration of Constantine's sons. In 341 Constantius issued an edict forbidding, in general terms, all heathen sacrifices. Later edicts (in 346 and 356) ordered temples to be closed, and attached the death penalty to the crime of sacrificing to the gods. But of these laws there was certainly no rigorous and universal enforcement. The temples in the city of Rome, for example, were left unassailed; and it is recorded that the prefect of the city did not scruple to sacrifice publicly on occasion of certain calamities. Violence seems to have been expended mainly in the plundering of temples; and, even against this, protest was not wholly wanting from the Christian side. "With the gold of the State," said Hilary, in his criticism of Constantius, "you burden the sanctuary of God; and what is plundered from the temples, or won by confiscations, or extorted by punishments, you obtrude upon God." From the statements of the heathen historian Ammianus Marcellinus, it would appear that some of the spoil gained by this plunder and exaction did not find its way to the sanctuary; for we find him complaining that

Constantius consumed the marrow of the provinces in the fattening of his favorites.[1]

The adherence of the heathen to their own religion was marked by too little of courage and steadfastness to give rise to sanguinary persecution, even had the government been disposed to stop short of no severity requisite for the work of thorough repression. Constantius, therefore, was quite as conspicuous for persecuting Christians who dissented from his standard as for making war upon heathenism. Bishops refusing to conform to his semi-Arian scheme had nothing better to expect than deposition and exile.

The policy of Constantius was ill-adapted to advance Christianity to a genuine and complete triumph over the remnants of heathenism in the realm. Though many professed to forsake their idolatries, it was no hearty or enlightened espousal which they made of the Christian faith. External pressure may make hypocrites, but it cannot make believers. It only needed a reversal of policy, on the part of the government, to show the worthlessness of many of the recent conversions. With the death of Constantius in 361, and the accession of Julian, that reversal came.

II.—JULIAN THE APOSTATE.

Julian, the son of Constantius, who was a half-brother of Constantine the Great, was born in the year 331. He was therefore but six years old when the massacre, which followed close upon the death of his uncle, cut off his father, an older brother, and others of his rela-

[1] Lib. XVI.

tives. Nothing but his tender years saved him from being numbered with the victims. He was educated in Constantinople until about 344, when he was sent, with his brother Gallus,[1] to Cappadocia. Here the brothers remained for six years, in a kind of honorable imprisonment, under the tuition of clergymen. Soon after the close of this interval, Gallus was raised to the rank of a Cæsar, and Julian obtained permission to study in Nicomedia, under the condition, however, that he would not hear the celebrated heathen rhetorician Libanius. Julian, in appearance, observed this condition, and, moreover, gave ostensible indications of a Christian zeal by serving as a reader in the church; but it is understood that he studied the orations of Libanius in secret, and had communication with distinguished apostles of heathenism, among whom was Maximus. The fall and execution of Gallus, in 354, endangered the life of Julian; but he was rescued by the kind interposition of the Empress Eusebia, and was even allowed to pursue his studies in Athens. An unexpected summons soon called him from this retreat; and, honored with the rank of a Cæsar, he was sent to command the legions in Gaul. Success attended his arms in that quarter. On the exhibition of jealousy by Constantius, his enthusiastic troops proclaimed him Augustus; and he was already on the march for the East, to contend for the sole rule, when the death of Constantius (in 361) left him the undisputed master of the whole Empire. The hand of a professed heathen now swayed the sceptre over the heads of Christians.

[1] More strictly speaking, a half-brother, as was also the one who fell in the massacre.

It is hardly to be counted an occasion for surprise, that the apostasy of Julian should have become incorporated into the very name by which he is known in history. That a member of the family which had brought Christianity from the horrors of the Diocletian persecution, and enthroned it in the palace of the Cæsars, — a nephew of the great Constantine, — should turn his back upon the triumphant faith and espouse heathenism, could not fail to produce a profound impression. To the minds of Christians it was as if Antichrist had suddenly come forth from the very centre of the Church.

Yet the apostasy of Julian was no miracle of caprice, no event to which antecedents cannot be assigned. On the one hand, it was a strange charity which Julian had received from Christianity, or rather from its unfaithful representatives. To a Christian emperor he owed it (such at least was his own belief) that his dearest friends had been slaughtered.[1] Thus orphaned, he became an object of suspicious tutelage. An obvious attempt was made to hold him aloof from heathen culture and influence. All the instincts of independence in his nature were challenged to elect the forbidden field. And to this bent his spiritual advisers were able to offer no proper antidote through a positive commendation of Christianity. They were probably themselves destitute of a true inner acquaintance with the Christian system, and were incompetent to lead their pupil, even to the threshold of the truth as it is in Christ.

[1] In a letter to the Athenians, Julian gives an account of the massacre, in which he indicates no doubt about the responsibility of Constantius, though he charitably mentions such considerations as might extenuate his guilt.

While thus repelled by unworthy representatives, and by a false image of Christianity, Julian felt the positive attractions of classic heathenism. By an alliance with Neo-Platonism, the classic system had gained a new lease of life, especially among the rhetoricians and their pupils in the East. A romantic veneration for the past naturally took delight in reviewing the old mythologies, and at the same time a philosophizing temper could find satisfaction in giving to these mythologies some recondite interpretation. Not a little patronage was awarded these devotees of classic literature; and they were able to gather flourishing schools at Miletus, Ephesus, Antioch, Athens, and other places. They were not, in general, men of great profundity; but they had polish and pretension on their side. They prided themselves on being the representatives of culture in the Empire. Christianity was decried as barbarous and uncouth, — a religion for the ignorant multitude. All the truth which it contained, they claimed to have also in their system, only in much finer form. Like some of the pretentious critics of later times, they set themselves over against Christian coarseness as the school of refinement and wisdom, moving amid the chaste ideals of classic taste and beauty.

The prepared heart of Julian easily succumbed to the lure of this cultured heathenism. When he made open declaration of his faith, as he was on the eve of contending with Constantius for the supremacy, he had already been a secret devotee of the heathen religion for about ten years, had received, indeed, an induction of the most positive and solemn type; having first been made a proselyte by Maximus at Ephesus (352), and

subsequently, during his stay at Athens, having been initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries.[1] The main features of the system to which he became an enthusiastic convert are happily set forth in the following description by Milman: "Julian's religion was the eclectic paganism of the new Platonic philosophy. The chief speculative tenet was Oriental, rather than Greek or Roman. The one immaterial, inconceivable Father dwelt alone. Though His majesty was held in reverence, the direct and material object of worship was the great sun, the living and animated and beneficent image of the immaterial Father. Below this primal Deity and His glorious image, there was room for the whole Pantheon of subordinate deities, of whom, in like manner, the stars were the material representatives, but who possessed invisible powers, and manifested themselves in various ways, through prodigies and oracles, the flights of birds, and the signs in the sacrificial victims."[2] In other words, Julian was devoted to the classic system, colored and interpreted after the peculiar fashion of Neo-Platonism.

As emperor, Julian made it his leading aim to restore the heathen faith and worship. In laboring for this re-

[1] The initiation is commonly placed at this date. See, among others, Friedrich Rode, Geschichte der Reaction Kaiser Julians; and G. H. Rendall, The Emperor Julian. The date in question is thought to be favored by Eunapius (Vitæ Sophist., Maximus). John Wordsworth, on the other hand (article on Julian in Smith and Wace), concludes from the reference of Gregory Nazianzen (Orat., iv. 55), that the initiation did not occur till Julian became heir to the imperial dignity, and was ready to declare his espousal of heathenism. Gregory's account, it is true, appears to favor the latter date. But a question may be raised as to whether in his rhetorical effusion he was careful to observe the chronological order of events.

[2] History of Christianity.

sult, he was not above the use of material inducements. He felt that there were proselyting expedients aside from arguments. Even his friend Libanius allows his use of gifts and honors, as bribes, to win adherents to his religion; nay, he unblushingly commends such a policy. "Through a little gain," he says, "the soldier obtains a greater gain, acquiring, through gold, the friendship of the gods, upon whom depends the fortune of war."[1] A peculiar specimen, surely, of the elevation of this class of men above the Christianity which they affected to despise!

But the chief dependence of Julian in his restoration efforts was placed upon the following means: (1) a systematic degradation of Christianity; (2) a thorough reformation and re-organization of heathenism. He looked upon violence as a very doubtful means of propagandism. His knowledge of history persuaded him that to make martyrs would be a dangerous and ill-advised course. He assumed, at once, to grant religious liberty to all parties. This course, however, so far as the contending sects of the Christians were concerned, was dictated more by policy than by a spirit of toleration. Such, at least, is the verdict of the heathen writer Ammianus, who affirms that Julian gave equal freedom to all the different parties of the Christans, in order that by their contentions they might weaken and cripple each other.[2] Something, of course, is to be conceded to the obvious inconvenience which would have been imposed upon Julian in an attempt to discriminate between different factions in the Church. It was as convenient as politic to treat all alike. But the attitude of the pagan

[1] Quoted by Neander. [2] Lib. XXII.

Emperor toward all classes of Christians is better described as one of equal intolerance, than as one of equal tolerance. To humble, to degrade, and to limit the rival system as far as possible, was a design pursued by him with unremitting diligence. He withdrew the revenues which had been appropriated to the support of the Christian ministry, and bestowed them upon his own priesthood. He ordered that reparation should be made for the spoliations of heathen temples which had occurred during the preceding reigns. To stamp Christianity as the religion of ignorance, he forbade Christians to appear as teachers of the classics; at any rate, he passed a law that no one should take the office of a teacher in these things without a permit from the government, and laid down principles which practically closed the vocation against loyal Christians. To exclude Christian teachers from the schools was, in large measure, equivalent to excluding also the children of Christian parents, since the latter could not help fearing the influence of schools dedicated to heathenism. "Let them," he scornfully said of the Christian instructors, "go to the churches of the Galileans to expound Matthew and Luke." The edict was as contemptuous in tone as tyrranical in conception. Even a heathen historian speaks of it as something which ought to be buried in everlasting silence.[1] With kindred aim, he excluded Christians from important offices, and advanced pagan devotees to positions of trust. He also used his opportunity to heap sarcasms upon the Christians. As the decree on education illustrates, he gave a loose rein to this evil license

[1] Illud inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio. (AMMIANUS, Lib. XXII.)

even in his official communications. "Galileans" was the name under which he habitually stigmatized the adherents of Christianity. In a spirit of indifference to the scruples of Christians, if not with the positive design to perplex their consciences, he surrounded his own image with the images of the gods, so that Christians could not offer the customary token of respect to the imperial bust without at the same time rendering a seeming acknowledgment to the heathen deities.[1] In all this there was, it is true, no drawing of the sword; yet it was well nigh as remote from genuine tolerance as a Diocletian edict. Moreover, it is not improbable that Julian, had he held the throne long enough, would have resorted to open violence. His dealing with Athanasius shows the venom rankling in his heart. As his own words indicate, he banished him from Egypt for no other cause than his too powerful antagonism to heathenism.[2] "The death of Athanasius," says Gibbon, "was not expressly commanded; but the prefect of Egypt understood that it was safer for him to exceed than to neglect the orders of an irritated master. The archbishop prudently retired to the monasteries of the desert; eluded, with his usual dexterity, the snares of the enemy; and lived to triumph over the ashes of a prince, who, in words of formidable import, had declared his wish that the whole venom of the Galilean school were contained in the single person of Athanasius."[3]

[1] Gregory Nazianzen assumes (Orat., iv. 81) that the arrangement was purposely adopted to put the Christians in a dilemma. But perhaps, as Rendall suggests, the primary design of Julian was to give open and striking confession of his own faith, rather than to perplex his opponents.

[2] Epistles vi., xxvi., and li. in select works of Julian, as given by John Duncombe, are directed against Athanasius.

[3] Chap. xxiii.

Julian expected much also from a reform of heathenism itself. He believed that there was virtue enough in the system to insure its triumph, if only its professors would be earnest in living out and advocating its principles. He set himself an eminent example of this theory. Not only did he sacrifice with surprising assiduity and liberality, sending perchance a hundred oxen to the altar in a single day,[1] but he cultivated a strict morality, put aside ostentation, and lived with a plainness in marked contrast with the style of his Christian predecessors. He endeavored to re-organize the heathen priesthood somewhat after the plan of the Christian hierarchy. He ordered that the best men, those strictest in life and most benevolent in temper, should be chosen for the office of priests; and that in this office they should hold themselves aloof from all impure associations, avoiding the theatre and tavern and every kindred place, and giving themselves entirely to things sacred. It was urged, also, that they should take pains to instruct the people, and look carefully after the poor. Here the reviler of Christianity was evidently copying its precepts and customs; indeed, he made no secret respecting his model, declaring that it would be a shame if the heathen were negligent towards their own poor, while Christians were accustomed to extend their benefactions even to the unfortunate outside of their own ranks.[2]

It was just in this direction of reform that Julian experienced the most humiliating failure. He counted upon a moral earnestness that was by no means to be

[1] Ammianus, Lib., XXII.

[2] Epistle to Arsacius, High-priest of Galatia.

found among the heathen of his day. The spirit which makes martyrs, or even self-denying advocates, of a cause, did not exist in their midst. Many of his own party became weary of his exhortations and ascetic restrictions. In Antioch, especially, whither he came in 362, his revival efforts met with flat indifference. The people were ready to admire and to praise him as emperor, but they wanted no yoke of devotion bound to their necks. Some did not hesitate even to assail the imperial devotee with their sarcasms. His long philosophical beard was commented on, and it was said that it ought to be cut off and manufactured into ropes.[1] In particular, his excessive sacrificing was satirized. The image of a bull and an altar upon his coins was interpreted as a symbol of his having desolated the world.[2] The remark was handed about, that, if Julian should return victorious from his contemplated Persian expedition, the breed of horned cattle must infallibly be extinguished.[3] The Emperor, on his part, devoted a special treatise to the satirizing of the Antiochians.

It was during his stay at Antioch, and under the imbittered feelings of his poor success, that Julian began to employ his pen in an elaborate treatise against the Christian faith, a task which he continued during his Persian expedition. From the extracts of his work which have been preserved in the reply of Cyril of Alexandria, it would seem to have reproduced the principal arguments of the earlier heathen critics. In spirit it was closely akin to the work of Celsus. Some of his strictures — as, for example, his comments on the magical

[1] Misopogon, Julian's satirical work against the Antiochians.
[2] Socrates, Hist. Eccl., iii. 17. [3] Ammianus, Lib. XXV.

virtue attributed to baptism, and the reverence paid to the tombs of the martyrs — had, no doubt, a basis in the corruptions of the age. But, on the whole, he appears scarcely superior to Celsus in respect of fairness. He complains of the poverty of the Bible in general, declaring it totally incompetent to develop manly strength and wisdom. He makes capital out of the anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament, denies that its prophecies forshadowed such a being as Christ is figured to have been, and takes the Christians to task for ceasing to follow its sumptuary and ceremonial prescriptions. The doctrine of a divine incarnation he treats with as little respect as did Celsus before him. The dogma of Christ's divinity, he says, was introduced by John, who thus contradicted the teaching of the other evangelists. He does not impute moral turpitude to Christ, or deny His miracles. At the same time he disparages His life as being an unedifying spectacle of weakness and futility. Julian's criticisms indicate, perhaps, a rather larger acquaintance with the letter of the Bible than that which had been acquired by the older apologists for heathenism. But evidently to its spirit, to the grand movement of revelation which it exhibits, to the lofty ideals which it lifts above man's spiritual horizon, he was as blind as they.

While, as the above indicates, Julian reprobated the religion of the Old Testament, he nevertheless showed no little consideration for the Jews. Indeed, his treatment of them was in marked contrast with his scorn and oppression of the Christians. One can hardly escape sharing the conviction of early Christian writers, that his friendliness toward the Jews found a special

stimulus in the known fact of their hostility to Christianity. "He sent for them," says Theodoret, "and asked them why they did not offer sacrifices according to the injunctions of the law. When they told him that sacrifices should be offered only at Jerusalem, this impious man commanded them to rebuild their temple, foolishly imagining to confute the prediction of the Lord concerning it."[1] His patronage of the enterprise was carried even to the extent of furnishing means. But the attempt to restore the temple proved utterly abortive, the workmen being frightened away by the breaking out of flames from the excavations, and by still other prodigies, if the writers of that and the succeeding age can be trusted.[2]

In the year 363 Julian, having completed his preparations, started upon his Persian expedition. There was a feeling that in the issue of this campaign a judgment from God would be revealed, either to the signal advantage of heathenism or of Christianity. The reply of a Christian to Libanius indicates what some were expecting from the ruling of Providence. "What is the Son of the Carpenter doing now?" asked the rhetorician sarcastically. "The Creator of the universe," responded the Christian, "whom you deride, and call the Son of the Carpenter, is now preparing a bier."[3] A horseman's spear, or javelin, prepared the fulfilment. Julian ended his career beyond the Tigris. It is tradition, rather than authentic history, which has put upon

[1] Hist. Eccl., iii. 20. Compare Philostorgius, Hist. Eccl., vii. 9.

[2] Ammianus, Lib. XXIII.; Gregory Nazianzen, Orat., v. 4; Rufinus, Hist. Eccl., i. 38, 39; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., v. 22; Theodoret, Hist. Eccl., iii. 20; Philostorgius, vii. 14.

[3] Theodoret, iii. 23.

his dying lips the words, "Galilean, thou hast conquered!" Theodoret, it is true, ascribes to him this exclamation. But it is unmentioned by Socrates, and Sozomen substitutes for it a symbolical act. "When he was wounded," writes the latter historian, "he took some of the blood that flowed from the wound, and threw it up into the air, as if he had seen Jesus Christ, and intended to throw it at Him, in order to reproach Him with his death. Others say that he was angry with the sun, because it had favored the Persians, and had not rescued him, although, according to the doctrines of the astronomers, it had presided at his birth; and that it was to express his indignation against this luminary that he took blood, and flung it upwards in the air."[1] The Arian historian Philostorgius describes the act of Julian much in the same way as Sozomen, but accepts the interpretation last mentioned. "The wretched Julian," he says, "took up in his hands the blood which flowed from his wounds, and cast it up toward the sun, exclaiming, 'Take thy fill;' and he added curses upon the other gods as villains and destroyers."[2] On the other hand, Ammianus represents the wounded Emperor as receiving his fate with equanimity, and indeed as spending his last hours in a philosophic discourse, in which he expressed entire satisfaction with his life and conduct and future prospects.[3] If this account be true, the resignation of Julian greatly exceeded that of some of his heathen friends. Libanius even went so far as to reproach the gods for allowing such a man as Constantius to reign twenty years, while the time allotted to Julian was scarcely twenty months.

[1] Hist. Eccl., vi. 2. [2] Hist. Eccl., vii. 15. [3] Lib. XXV.

Amid these conflicting accounts, history can afford to be comparatively silent. No dying expression of personal chagrin and mortification is needed to emphasize the defeat of the Apostate. He thought to stand forth in history, covered with glory, as the restorer of classic heathenism. He stands, in fact, a monument of its irretrievable overthrow. The stronger his efforts to revive the fallen system, the more conclusive he made the evidence that the breath of life had departed.

Though exhibiting many brilliant qualities, Julian stood far below the first rank in greatness. He lacked the self-abandon which belongs to the highest type of character. In his acting and in his writing, he reminds too much of one practising before a mirror, and calculating upon effect. Again, his dedication of his best efforts to a utopian scheme speaks against the soundness of his judgment. He seemed unable to grasp the fact that classic heathenism was dead, and that Christianity must take its place. He described Constantine's work as the planting of Adonis gardens, whose bloom would soon wither.[1] The estimate applied rather to his own work. The words with which Athanasius cheered discomfited Christians, on the eve of his exile, were abundantly fulfilled: "Nubicula est, transibit" ("It is only a little cloud, it will pass over"). Strauss was not far out of the way in naming Julian "the romancer upon the throne of the Cæsars." He acted emphatically the part of a romancer or enthusiast in his veneration for, and attempted restoration of, an obsolete past.

[1] The representation occurs in his ingenious work entitled The Cæsars.

III.—THE POLICY OF SUCCEEDING EMPERORS TOWARD HEATHENISM.

The discretion of the emperor who followed Julian saved Christian rule, for the time being, from an unfavorable contrast with heathen rule, as respects tolerance. Jovian earned the hearty encomiums of representative heathens, such as Themistius, by granting full liberty for the exercise of their religion, those obnoxious rites alone excepted for which no one expected a governmental sanction. Valentinian, Emperor of the West from 364 to 375, adhered in general to the same principles; a superstitious zeal in prosecuting those suspected of practising magic being his most serious exhibition of intolerance. Valens (364–378), Emperor of the East, by the grace of his brother Valentinian, acknowledged the same laws in relation to heathenism, and sanctioned a similar severity against all supposed to be guilty of magic and divination. The reputation for intolerance attached to Valens is due rather to the rigor with which, as an Arian, he treated the orthodox party, than to any violent attack upon heathenism. It was during the joint reign of these emperors that the word *paganism* was first employed officially as a designation of a religion.[1] Gratian, who followed Valentinian in the rule of the West, while he issued no sweeping prohibition against the practice of heathenism, dealt it a destructive blow by ordering that the revenues of the temples, and the public support which had been given to priests and vestals, should be withdrawn. He also commanded the statue and altar of Victory to be re-

[1] Codex Theodos., Lib. XVI., Tit. ii. 18.

moved from the Senate. A strong effort was made by heathen partisans to have these measures repealed; but the diligence and energy of Ambrose, who was highly influential both with Gratian and his successor, Valentinian II., defeated the attempt.

In 379 Theodosius came to the throne of the East, and in 394 his success in overthrowing the usurper Eugenius gave him also the rule over the West. Reversing the policy of Valens in relation to the doctrinal controversies of the age, he assisted the orthodox party to a final victory. As regards heathenism, his decrees and his practice indicated for a considerable time a wavering between toleration and proscription; but in 391 he entered decidedly upon a policy of total repression, — that is, of heathen rites. The mere belief, or even its advocacy, he did not think of touching, and numbered professed heathen among his friends and officers. By a law of 392, the offering of idolatrous sacrifices was declared a *crimen majestatis*, and as such might be capitally punished. This penalty, however, had its place in the statute-book, rather than in actual execution. "The ready obedience of the pagans," says Gibbon, "protected them from the pains and the penalties of the Theodosian code."[1] But if their persons were spared, their temples in many instances were not. No general edict was issued by Theodosius for their destruction; but the passions of the populace, and the fanatical zeal of the monks, urged on, in various districts, the work of spoliation and ruin. In some cases retaliation was provoked from the heathen. We read of Christian churches being burned in Palestine and

[1] Chap. xxviii.

Phœnicia In Alexandria the heathen requited what they deemed an insult to their faith (namely, an ostentatious parading of the indecent symbols found in a temple which had been devoted to the worship of Bacchus) with violence and bloodshed; and, indeed, they so far committed themselves by their sedition, that they finally counted it good fortune that they were allowed to escape with their lives, though obliged to witness the destruction of the magnificent temple of Serapis, as well as of less noted edifices.

A similar course, attended with similar incidents, was pursued by the sons of Theodosius, Arcadius, and Honorius, and by their immediate successors. The episode most disgraceful to the Christian side was the murder at Alexandria, in 415, of the beautiful and talented female philosopher Hypatia. It is to be observed, however, that, while professed Christians were the agents in this brutal and unchristian deed, it was not altogether in the name of religion that it was accomplished. Political motives were prominent. The deed, moreover, was that of a mob, — a mob drawn from a populace noted for its turbulence and ferocity. "The Alexandrians," says Socrates, who was in middle life at the time of the tragedy, "are more delighted with tumult than any other people; and if they can find a pretext they will break forth into most intolerable excesses."[1] The same historian speaks in the highest terms of the character and ability of Hypatia, representing her as gaining universal admiration by her dignified modesty of deportment, as drawing students from a great distance to hear her exposition of the Neo-Platonic philosophy, and as

[1] Hist. Eccl., vii. 13.

surpassing all the philosophers of her time through her attainments in literature and science. "Yet even she fell a victim," he continues, "to the political jealousy which at that time prevailed. For as she had frequent interviews with Orestes [the prefect], it was calumniously reported among the Christian populace that it was by her influence he was prevented from being reconciled to Cyril. Some of them, therefore, whose ringleader was a reader named Peter, hurried away by a fierce and bigoted zeal, entered into a conspiracy against her; and observing her as she returned home in her carriage, they dragged her from it, and carried her to a church called Cæsareum, where they completely stripped her, and murdered her with shells. After tearing her body in pieces, they took her mangled limbs to a place called Cinaron, and there burned them. An act so inhuman could not fail to bring the greatest opprobrium, not only upon Cyril, but also upon the whole Alexandrian Church."[1] The judgment which the Christian historian passes upon the deed, it may fairly be presumed, was the judgment of intelligent and sober-minded Christians the Empire over.

As heathenism had very little to contend for, it gradually succumbed. Only a remnant of it was left in the East by the time of Justinian (527–565), and to this the despotic emperor endeavored to give a finishing blow. Heathen worship was declared by him a capital offence, and its last source of intellectual prestige was quenched by the abolition of the philosophical school of Athens. In the West, the incursions of the barbarians left little chance for the exercise of any central and

[1] Hist. Eccl., vii. 15.

decisive authority on the subject. But as the barbarians themselves had no favor for the old classic heathenism, it found no refuge, save in the hearts of occasional devotees in the cities, and in the rites which might safely be practised in the unfrequented districts.

IV.—HEATHEN AND CHRISTIAN APOLOGY.

The example of Julian shows that there were representatives of heathenism in this period who were disposed to write from the stand-point of a proud and scornful superiority to Christianity. But many of the heathen authors, especially after the collapse of Julian's scheme, were constrained to assume quite a humble attitude. Instead of engaging in bitter and confident attacks upon their rival, they thought it needful to uphold their own tottering system, and to show reasons why it should obtain tolerance.

As advocates of a waning cause, the pagan apologists were placed at a disadvantage. But, on the other hand, there were certain respects in which the very dethronement of their religion helped them to arguments against their opponents. As Christianity now held the reins of power, it could be held responsible, with more show of reason than previously, for the calamities falling upon or threatening the Empire. It was also somewhat of an apologetic advantage to the heathen, that they had the opportunity of preaching the doctrines of religious tolerance to the Christians themselves. Thus we find Libanius reminding the partisans of Christianity that they were acting in direct violation of the principles of their own religion, in destroying the heathen temples;

since that religion prescribes persuasion, and condemns any resort to force, as a means of its own advancement. External compulsion, he argues, can only produce hypocrites, not true converts. Themistius likewise extols the policy of toleration, for the benefit of the Christian rulers, and declares that he who applies force in matters of religion robs man of that freedom which God has made his birthright. These statements, to be sure, were liable to the suspicion of being prompted by mere self-interest; moreover, they involved a decided impeachment of heathenism, considering its long record in the past as an instigator of bloody persecution: still, it was an item quite favorable to the dignity of their cause, that the heathen apologists were able to preach the doctrine of tolerance to their opponents. Finally, the excessive reverence paid to the Virgin and the saints could be pleaded as an ostensible justification of polytheism; and, if we may judge from the carefulness of Christian writers to deny that the saints were in any wise regarded as deities, the advocates of paganism did not fail to improve the opportunity afforded.

Most of those renowned as apologists of heathenism in this period belonged to the Neo-Platonic school. Such was the case with Libanius and the contemporary rhetoricians, Themistius and Aurelius Symmachus; also with the philosophers, Proclus of Athens and Simplicius, belonging, the former to the fifth, and the latter to the sixth century. Both of these philosophers, however, had a high appreciation for Aristotle as well as for Plato. Proclus, according to Erdmann, represents the culmination of Neo-Platonism as a system, though in genius and originality he may be ranked below the earlier rep-

resentatives, Plotinus and Jamblicus.[1] A work by Proclus, while it does not mention Christianity by name, was designed to refute its doctrines of the creation and end of the world. This work found an answer, after about a century, from the pen of the Alexandrian John Philoponus. Among the heathen historians of the period, Ammianus Marcellinus presents an eminent example of impartiality; Eunapius and Zosimus, on the other hand, wrote in the spirit of zealous partisans.

The changed circumstances were not without their effect upon Christian apology. The apparent impotence of the heathen gods to defend their own cause gave a certain advantage to the friends of the gospel. But, on the other hand, they could not appeal to the pure lives of Christians with quite that boldness and confidence which were indulged by the apologists of an earlier period; for corruption had come in, and some of the very men who argued against heathenism openly deplored the vices of the ill-disciplined masses which had invaded the Church. Still, there was at hand plenty of trophies of the regenerating power and reforming influence of Christianity; so that no hesitation was felt in defending it from a practical, as well as a theoretical, stand-point. Learned and thoughtful apologies were produced. Some of the best talent of the Church was employed in this field.

Among the apologetic writers of the Greek Church, a prominent place must be assigned to the historian Eusebius Pamphilus, Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine. His "Evangelic Preparation" and his "Evangelic Demonstration" are both elaborate treatises. The former is a

[1] Geschichte der Philosophie, § 130.

critique of heathenism; the latter gives the positive arguments for the truth of Christianity. Like the earlier apologists, Eusebius makes large account of the element of prophecy. Among the points most successfully treated is the relation between the two dispensations, in the light of which both the use of the Old Testament and the departure from it in various particulars, on the part of Christians, are justified. Good work is also done in refuting the notion that Christianity could have been the product of fraud. These writings were probably quite effective in winning converts from the heathen. Thus the testimony of Evagrius imports, who speaks of Eusebius as "an especially able writer, to the extent in particular of inducing his readers to embrace our religion, though failing to perfect them in the faith."[1]

Athanasius, in his early years, before his absorbing engagement in the Arian controversy, devoted two treatises to apology; namely, his "Discourse against the Greeks," and his "Discourse on the Incarnation of the Logos." The first of these is mainly an expansion of the ideas contained in the first chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The second attempts to show the needfulness, the reasonableness, and the verity of the incarnation of the Son of God. In neither is there an ostentatious display of learning: quotation is made chiefly from the biblical writers; and the aptitude of the author for effective argumentation is revealed by his endeavor to confine himself to a clear and satisfactory presentation of a few points.

Theodoret, near the middle of the fifth century, composed an apology entitled, "The Healing of the

[1] Hist. Eccl., Pref.

Heathen Affections." It is a very well arranged treatise, and not a few points are handled with great skill. A decidedly happy sally is made, at the opening, against the pride especially characteristic of the Neo-Platonic philosophers or rhetoricians of the East, and manifested in disparaging comments on the style of the Bible, or in a repudiation of the thought of being instructed in the truths of religion by fishermen. He reminds such that they are unreasonably fastidious, and are acting counter to the example of the most illustrious fathers of philosophy. Men who properly value truth are not so very particular about the shape in which it is presented. Hence we have the account of Plato and others visiting foreign nations, and eagerly appropriating any thing valuable in their stores, regardless of Greek polish. It is the quality of the fabric that is a matter of concern, not the race or condition of the artisan. This is a principle universally allowed in trade, and has been virtually allowed by the proud Platonists themselves in affairs of the mind. They place Socrates at the very head of philosophers; and yet he was only the son of a stone-cutter, worked much himself at his father's trade, and, using the word in a technical sense, was comparatively illiterate. To prejudge the apostolic writings, therefore, on the charge that they are the products of mere fishermen, is to give the reins to blind and unreasonable prejudice. In the same connection he deals with the charge that Christians disparaged knowledge and summoned men to a headlong faith. He hints that the charge does not come with the best of grace from a party whose distinguished philosopher, Pythagoras, required his disci-

ples, at least for a long interval, to accept his bare *ipse dixit* without questioning. He denies that the Christians disparage knowledge. At the same time he insists upon the value of faith, maintaining that it is in a manner the basis and condition of knowledge, since the elementary principles upon which rational thinking depends must be accepted by faith; and, moreover, the effective impulse to attention and investigation is dependent upon faith. In the following portions of the treatise he emphasizes the superior clearness, consistency, and elevation of Christian teaching on the great themes which concern man as a moral and religious being.

The list of Latin apologists in this period begins with Lactantius, a pupil of Arnobius. After having distinguished himself as a teacher of rhetoric at Sicca in North Africa, and also at the court of Diocletian in Nicomedia, he became an advocate of the Christian cause under the patronage of Constantine. His chief apologetic work, the "Divine Institutes," was composed in the first years of the Constantinian era. This production, as respects logical arrangement and economical presentation of thought, is quite remote from a model. As regards the subject-matter also, the author indicates that he had not been very thoroughly schooled in theology, and was better prepared to combat heathen errors than to give a positive construction of Christianity. His work, however, is written in elegant Latin, and shows a broad acquaintanceship with classic literature. Cicero is quoted frequently in a quite appreciative manner, and no doubt the flowing sentences of Lactantius were due in part to his familiarity with the writings of the

great orator. The author of the "Institutes" comments to good effect upon the disagreements between the philosophers, upon the impurities and criminal practices connected with heathenism, and upon its formalism and materialism as contrasted with the spirituality of Christianity. "Our religion," he says, "is on this account firm and solid and unchangeable, because it teaches justice, because it is always with us, because it has its existence altogether in the soul of the worshipper, because it has the mind itself for a sacrifice."[1] It is noteworthy that Lactantius appeals, with much of the confidence of the older apologists, to the transforming power exerted by Christianity upon the character and habits of its converts.[2] Another feature connecting him with the earlier period is the little stress which he places upon the evidence of miracle as compared with that of prophecy; indeed, he hardly assigns to it as much weight as did some of his predecessors. "Christ," he says, "was not believed by us to be God on this account, because he did wonderful things, but because we saw that all things were done in His case which were announced to us by the prediction of the prophets. He performed wonderful deeds: we might have supposed Him to be a magician, as you [heathen] now suppose him to be, and the Jews then supposed Him, if all the prophets did not with one accord proclaim that Christ would do those very things."[3]

In the early part of the fifth century, the Spanish presbyter Orosius wrote a general history with an apologetic design. His aim was to show, by an ample exhibit of the evils which had befallen men apart from

[1] v. 20. [2] iii. 26. [3] v. 3.

Christianity, that it could not properly be held responsible for existing evils. Near the middle of the same century, the Gallic presbyter Salvianus, in a work on the providence and judgments of God, accounted for the evils of the times in a way less sparing of his fellow-Christians; for he painted their follies and vices in dark, perhaps over-drawn, colors, and represented the untoward events from which they were suffering as only a just retribution from the hand of God. But our attention is speedily withdrawn from these writings to a production of far greater scope and power which came between them. "The City of God" (*De Civitas Dei*), by Augustine, ranks as the masterpiece of apology contributed by the Latin Church after the days of Tertullian. It suffers indeed from diffuseness. In terseness and energy it falls below the treatises of the fiery Carthaginian, but it rises far above them in breadth and elevation of thought. The city or kingdom of God, as contrasted with the kingdom of this world, is the theme to which the twenty-two books of the work are devoted; and the majesty of the treatment corresponds in many passages to the majesty of the subject. One cannot rise from its perusal without feeling, with Augustine, that this divine city is indeed "a city surpassingly glorious, whether we view it as it still lives by faith in this fleeting course of time, and sojourns as a stranger in the midst of the ungodly, or as it shall dwell in the fixed stability of its eternal seat, which it now with patience waits for."

Augustine wrote the "City of God" in the closing period of his life, a time that was fruitful in objections, from a temporal stand-point, against Christianity. Alaric

and his Goths had sacked the city of Rome. The barbaric inundation had begun, which threatened to sweep away the strongest pillars of the classic civilization. There was a chance for the heathen to complain that the adversities of the State were due to the usurpation of Christianity against the honor and the worship of the gods. To such murmurings Augustine replies by showing that temporal calamities are no new thing in history, nothing following exclusively in the wake of Christianity. He reminds the heathen Romans that their ancestors were again and again crushed under the weight of adversity, while yet there was not a Christian in their midst. He points to the fact that Rome, according to the teaching of her most honored poet, was founded under the patronage of *conquered* gods, — divinities whose defeat had been proclaimed by the ruined walls and burning buildings of Troy.[1] What security, he inquires, could be expected from such gods? and points to a long list of instances in which their guardianship had failed. Where, he asks, were the gods while Rome was being desolated with these calamities? "Where were they when, during ten successive years of reverses, the Roman army suffered frequent and great losses among the Veians? Where were they when the Gauls took, sacked, burned, and desolated Rome?"[2] It is in poor taste, he argues, for the worshippers of such gods to complain about the disastrous effects of Christianity, especially in face of the fact that nothing but Christian sanctuaries afforded them a refuge in the recent sacking of the imperial city.

But Augustine rises above this plane of judgment,

[1] i. 2. [2] iii. 17.

and asserts that a religion is not to be estimated chiefly, if at all, by its relation to temporal prosperity and dominion. He has the boldness to declare that the universal Empire of Rome is nothing indispensable. Its upbuilding was, to be sure, in a sense, a work of Divine providence. But it was only the preference for the lesser of two evils which inclined the Supreme Ruler to concede the government of the world to the Romans. "When the kingdoms of the East had been illustrious for a long time, it pleased God that there should also arise a Western empire, which, though later in time, should be more illustrious in extent and greatness. And, in order that it might overcome the grievous evils which existed among other nations, He purposely granted it to such men as, for the sake of honor and praise and glory, consulted well for their country, in whose glory they sought their own, and whose safety they did not hesitate to prefer to their own, suppressing the desire of wealth and many other vices for this one vice, namely, the love of praise."[1] Roman conquest and rule are, at best, only an unfortunate necessity springing from the abnormal condition of the times. Indeed, good men may fairly ask themselves the question, whether it is quite fitting to rejoice in extended empire. "For the iniquity of those with whom just wars are carried on favors the growth of a kingdom, which would certainly have been small if neighbors had not, by any wrong, provoked the carrying on of war against them; and human affairs being thus more happy, all kingdoms would have been small, rejoicing in neighborly concord."[2] The preserving a great empire intact and

[1] v. 13. [2] iv. 15.

prosperous, the enjoyment by sovereigns of long and victorious reigns, — these are to be counted very subordinate tests when the truth and merit of a religion are under consideration. God may, indeed, be concerned to show that temporal prosperity is in no wise dependent upon serving the heathen gods. And this lesson he has inculcated in a most signal manner by the extraordinary prosperity given to a Constantine and a Theodosius, men who totally repudiated the heathen worship. But, on the other hand, He has taken equal pains to show that temporal prosperity is by no means the chief concern or the principal gift of Christianity. "Lest any emperor should become a Christian in order to merit the happiness of Constantine, when every one should be a Christian for the sake of eternal life, God took away Jovian far sooner than Julian, and permitted that Gratian should be slain by the sword of a tyrant."[1]

With great emphasis Augustine urges that the supreme test of a religion is its ability to bestow spiritual and eternal good. Among the most striking features of his apology is the manner in which it soars above the current heathen notion of the gods as mere gods of the State, or patrons of earthly weal, and dwells upon the overshadowing importance of that spiritual and eternal kingdom which is to unfold its glory above and beyond all the wrecks of time. He teaches that good and ill in this world are mainly disciplinary or declarative. God punishes sin enough in the present to show the reality of His providence; He spares punishment sufficiently to illustrate His patience, and to intimate that there is

[1] v. 25.

judgment still in reserve. He bestows good things upon those asking for them sufficiently to demonstrate that gifts of this kind are at his disposal; He withholds good things in enough instances to teach that such are not the only rewards of His service, and to train men in godliness rather than in covetousness. From the Christian stand-point the chief concern is, not what kind of ills are suffered, but what kind of a man suffers them.[1] No earthly evil can harm a true member of Christ. All things work together for his good, for all things are made conducive to his preparation for the heavenly estate, in which is the unspeakable blessedness of the vision of God.[2] Now, what trust is to be reposed in the heathen gods as respects the bestowment of these spiritual and eternal blessings? Who would be guilty of the madness of expecting blessings of this order from the gods whose deeds are celebrated by the poets or represented in the theatres, — deeds more worthy of abhorrence than of imitation? "Shall eternal life be hoped for from these by whom this short and temporal life is polluted?"[3]

In some of the philosophers, Augustine finds a much better theology than the poetical or the civil. But it is only as they approached Christian ideas, he argues, that they give any worthy ideal of man's future estate; and, as respects showing the way to that ideal, they are

[1] i. 8.

[2] This was an emphatic point of view with Augustine. The vision of God, as it shall be enjoyed in the future life, was regarded by him as the peculiar reward of righteousness. His own estimate hardly fell short of that of Plotinus, whom he quotes as saying that the vision of God is "so infinitely desirable, that he who enjoys all other blessings in abundance, and has not this, is supremely miserable" (x. 16).

[3] vi. 6.

very poor and uncertain guides. Confessions by themselves of their uncertainty are not wanting. "Porphyry [for example] says that no system of doctrine which furnishes the universal way for delivering the soul has as yet been received, either from the truest philosophy, or from the ideas and practices of the Indians, or from the reasoning of the Chaldæans, or from any source whatever, and that no historical reading had made him acquainted with that way."[1] Porphyry, as Augustine states, wrote as one who had no true knowledge of Christianity. The universal way for delivering the soul has been published, and abundantly attested by prophecy and miracle and the experience of confessors and martyrs and all true believers, — the way concerning which Abraham received the divine assurance, "In thy seed shall all nations be blessed;" the way which the Saviour, after He had taken flesh of the seed of Abraham, declared, when He said of himself, "I am the way, the truth, and the life;" the way which purifies the whole man, and prepares the mortal in his whole being for immortality.

In the course of his argument, Augustine attempts to explain or to vindicate some of the more profound doctrines of the Christian system. A considerable space is given to tracing the history of the city of God and of its earthly rival. From the beginning of human history, the antagonism between the two cities has been manifest. "The founder of the earthly city was a fratricide. Overcome with envy, he slew his own brother, a citizen of the eternal city, and a sojourner on earth," — a deed paralleled, to some extent, at the foundation

[1] x. 32.

of Rome; "for of that city also, as one of their poets has mentioned, 'the first walls were stained with a brother's blood.'"[1] As were the relations in the beginning, so will they be even unto the end. The Church will continue to go forward on pilgrimage "amid the persecutions of the world and the consolations of God." No earthly vision can distinguish accurately, in the present, between the bounds of the two cities. But God knows who are citizens of the one and who of the other, and an unmistakable and eternal barrier shall be set up between them by the day of judgment.

V.—NATURE AND RESULTS OF THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

Under the first Christian emperors, the Church was not distinctly assigned the place and character of a State Church. There was no definite acknowledgment of ecclesiastical headship in the sovereign, such, for example, as was declared by the "Act of Supremacy" to belong to Henry VIII. over the Church of England. It was rather an informal alliance, that, in the first instance, was contracted. Church and State felt the uniting bond of common interests. The emperor saw that a measure of influence and agency in the affairs of the State might profitably be conceded to the Church. The Church felt that so useful an ally as the emperor ought to be allowed considerable prerogatives in her domain, that he might the more perfectly forward her interests. The extent to which imperial interference might properly go was not stated or understood; but

[1] xv. 5.

in an age of despotic rule the concession to the temporal prince to interfere at all, in a sovereign capacity, would naturally enable him in a short time to become a most powerful factor in the affairs of the Church. The tendency of such a concession is amply illustrated by the very first Christian reign.

Though it was not a case of the most positive union of Church and State, it was much more than a simple moral alliance between two independent factors which occurred under Constantine. He acknowledged, indeed, that it was no prerogative of his to determine the doctrinal standards of the Church; but he soon made it evident that he was not minded to assume a passive attitude toward the management of ecclesiastical interests. "He assumed," writes Eusebius, "as it were, the functions of a general bishop, constituted by God and convened synods of His ministers."[1] The same author reports him as having said to a company of bishops: "You are bishops whose jurisdiction is within the Church; I, also, am a bishop, ordained by God to overlook whatever is external to the Church."[2] If by things external he meant simply the temporalities of the Church, he much transcended the bounds here stated. He published decrees confirming the decisions of the bishops on questions of doctrine and worship, banished ecclesiastics who refused to subscribe the standard creed, ordered the restoration of excommunicated persons in the face of episcopal opposition,[3] and

[1] Vita Cons., i. 44. [2] Ibid., iv. 24.

[3] According to Socrates (Hist. Eccl., i. 27), he sent to Athanasius the following peremptory demand for the restoration of Arius and his partisans: "Since you have been apprised of my will, afford unhindered access into the Church to all who are desirous of entering it. For if it

prohibited the assemblies of various heretical and schismatic parties.[1]

How far the Church was drawn into the circle of the State is also seen in some of the privileges and functions that were assigned to ecclesiastics. The clergy were made, if not as respects their appointment, as respects their support, officers of the State; at least, a part of their support was ordered by Constantine to be paid out of the public treasury. "He wrote," says Theodoret, "to the governors of the provinces, directing that money should be given in every city to widows, orphans, and to those who were consecrated to the divine service; and he fixed the amount of their annual allowance more according to the impulse of his own generosity, than to the exigencies of their condition. The third part of the same is distributed to this day. Julian impiously withheld the whole; his successor distributed the sum which is now dispensed, the famine which then prevailed compelling him to do little."[2]

A legal standing, within certain limits, was awarded the bishops as judges or arbitrators. In the previous centuries it had been a principle in the Church to prohibit brethren from carrying their disputes before the heathen tribunals. Hence the bishops had frequent

shall be intimated to me that you have prohibited any of those claiming to be re-united to the Church, or have hindered their admission, I will forthwith send some one, who, at my command, shall depose you, and drive you into exile." Evidently a power which assumed to meddle with a prerogative so vitally related to ecclesiastical supremacy as this of managing the keys did not feel any strong obligation to keep off from any part of the ecclesiastical domain.

[1] Euseb., Vita Cons., iii. 64; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., ii. 32; Codex Theodos., Lib. XVI., Tit. v.

[2] Hist. Eccl., i. 11.

occasion to act as arbitrators. Constantine recognized this function in them, and provided by law that parties agreeing to submit their case to a bishop should abide by his decision.[1]

The successors of Constantine were not inclined to claim a less share in the management of the Church than was arrogated by him. Not content merely to follow up the action of the bishops, and to raise their decisions on doctrine and discipline to the character of imperial laws, they often, in addition to this, asserted their own will in ecclesiastical matters. Constantius, even more freely than his father, exercised a lordship over episcopal thrones, driving out one incumbent, setting up another, and bringing cogent means to bear for the overawing of bishops assembled in council. Others who followed claimed an equal license. Some even went so far as to issue authoritative decrees, in their own name, upon questions of dogma. This was notably the case, in the present period, with Basiliscus, Zeno, and Justinian.[2] In this assumption, however, these lay popes were none too successful. The current of thought and feeling in the Church had too much force and momentum to be easily diverted by any individual, with whatever official majesty he might be armed. More than one emperor found himself powerless to carry through a favorite scheme in relation to ecclesiastical affairs.

Evidently these new relations involved serious dangers. But they embraced, also, grand opportunities. The danger was that the Church should become per-

[1] Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., i. 9.
[2] Evagrius, Hist. Eccl., iii. 4, iii. 14, iv. 39.

vaded with too much of a secular and political spirit, and also suffer, at the hands of its ally, an abridgment of its liberty. The opportunity was the chance to sanctify worldly dominion, the open door through which the Church was invited to carry the influence of the gospel into all the departments of the State and of society. The radical isolation from the State, which Christianity had been compelled to assume in the previous centuries, was an unnatural position. Perilous as are riches and power, its office is not so much to renounce, as to sanctify them. Christianity was only coming to its rightful position when it came where it could lay its hand upon the throne, the sceptre, and the resources of empire. Church and State are never in proper relations, save as an intimate moral alliance subsists between them; that is, an attitude of mutual respect, sympathy, and well-wishing as respects the prosperity of each in its own sphere, an alliance which promotes the good of both without unduly sacrificing the independence of either. If, then, the new relations were detrimental to the Church, it was because the alliance was not a normal one, and because the Church failed in the task of sanctifying its added resources. As a matter of fact, both good and evil resulted, inasmuch as the alliance was in part abnormal, and inasmuch as the Church in part fulfilled, and in part failed to fulfil, its appointed task of sanctifying the worldly estate upon which it entered. Among the chief results to the Church, the following may be enumerated: —

1. *A mass of half-converted heathen.* The mere force of imperial example was enough to draw mul-

titudes into the Church. The prospect of imperial favor and worldly promotion caused many more to assume the Christian name. Even Eusebius testifies to the broad scope which Constantine's administration allowed to the operation of this corrupt motive, and denounces "the scandalous hypocrisy of those who crept into the Church, and assumed the name and character of Christians."[1] Augustine testifies to the force which similar considerations had in his day. "How many," he says, "seek Jesus for no other object but that he may bestow on them a temporal benefit! One has a business on hand: he seeks the intercession of the clergy. Another is oppressed by a more powerful than himself: he flies to the Church. Another desires intervention in his behalf with one with whom he has little influence. One in this way, one in that, the Church is daily filled with such people. Jesus is scarcely sought after for Jesus' sake."[2] Chrysostom uses this strong language: "The Lord commanded not to give that which is holy to the dogs, or to cast pearls before swine. We, however, moved by senseless vanity and ambition, have violated this command, in that we have admitted to a participation of the sacraments corrupt and unbelieving men, who are full of evil, before they have given us a definite proof of their disposition."[3] As the extracts may serve to intimate, the nobler and more earnest bishops sought to make the best possible use of the influx, and spared no pains to lead applicants for church-membership into a true under-

[1] Vita Cons., iv. 54. [2] Tract. in Joan., xxv. 10.

[3] Quoted by Neander from the treatise (περὶ καταν̓ύξεως) addressed to Demetrius.

standing and inner acceptance of Christianity. But those of more worldly temper were content to swell numbers irrespective of moral consequences. The inevitable result of such a policy was a mass of unassimilated material. Men came into the Church without any previous discipline in Christian morals, or training in the monotheistic faith. A lowered tone of Christian life, and an acceleration of tendencies toward polytheism, followed, as natural consequences. Those who had been accustomed to a long list of gods could easily be inclined to an idolatrous veneration of the Virgin and the saints.

2. *Encroachments of worldliness.* The transformation of the imperial court from the headquarters of heathen opposition into a principal asylum and defence of Christianity was a fact that gave by itself quite a new aspect to secular glory. Earthly splendor was made by this change to appear less foreign, less exclusively an attribute of the wicked Babylon. The personal customs of the early Christian emperors tended to re-enforce the impression thus initiated. Constantine did not hesitate to adopt the usual standard of Oriental magnificence, and he was quite outstripped in this respect by some of his successors. Arcadius, one of the sons of the great Theodosius, and his successor in the East, cultivated a pomp scarcely exceeded by any representative of heathen dominion. "When, on rare occasions," writes Milman, "Arcadius condescended to reveal to the public the majesty of the sovereign, he was preceded by a vast multitude of attendants, dukes, tribunes, civil and military officers, their horses glitter-

ing with golden ornaments, with shields of gold set with precious stones, and golden lances. They proclaimed the coming of the Emperor, and commanded the ignoble crowd to clear the streets before him. The Emperor stood or reclined in a gorgeous chariot, surrounded by his immediate attendants, distinguished by shields with golden bosses, set round with golden eyes, and drawn by white mules with gilded trappings. The chariot was set with precious stones; and golden fans vibrated with the movement, and cooled the air. The multitude contemplated at a distance the snow-white cushions, the silken carpets with dragons inwoven upon them in rich colors. Those who were fortunate enough to catch a glimpse of the Emperor beheld his ears loaded with golden rings, his arms with golden chains, his diadem set with gems of all hues, his purple robes in all their sutures embroidered with precious stones. The wondering people, on their return to their homes, could talk of nothing but the splendor of the spectacle, —the robes, the mules, the carpets, the size and splendor of the jewels."[1]

But it speedily became unnecessary to turn the eyes toward the imperial court to see a spectacle of wealth and magnificence within the bounds of a professed Christianity. The Church itself became possessed of great riches. The increasing of its revenues by gifts and legacies was regarded as a decided indication of religious zeal. Many also thought to purchase special grace to their souls by such means. So far was legacy-hunting and legacy-giving carried, in behalf of church purposes, that Valentinian I. thought it necessary to

[1] Hist. of Christianity, Book IV., chap. i.

impose certain restrictions.[1] Jerome allowed that there was adequate occasion for the restrictive legislation.[2] The bishops of the principal cities, were they so disposed, easily found the means of living in princely estate. The historian Ammianus speaks, for example, of the costly equipage of the Roman bishops, and of their feasts surpassing kings' tables.[3] Not unfrequently the attractions of the chief ecclesiastical positions excited the desires of men of a thoroughly worldly temper, and many were more than content to receive such as their spiritual overseers. "The people," said Gregory Nazianzen in his farewell address to the council at Constantinople, "seek now not priests, but rhetoricians; not pastors of souls, but managers of money; not those who offer with pure hearts, but powerful champions."[4]

It is not to be inferred, however, that the whole Church was swamped in this worldliness. There was a host of Christians in these centuries who stood nobly above the plane of avarice and ostentation. The same Ammianus who condemns the episcopal pomp of Rome praises the example afforded by some of the provincial bishops, "whose slender diet, humble apparel, and downcast eyes commend them, as pure and modest persons, to the eternal God and his true servants."[5] There were men in the foremost positions, like Athanasius, Basil, Augustine, and Chrysostom, who lived after a very abstinent mode, and gave their income to charitable purposes. Augustine even protested against hasty and imprudent donations to the Church. Being complained of for not enriching the Church more, he re-

[1] Codex Theod., Lib. XVI., Tit. ii. 20.
[2] Epist., lii. [3] Lib. XXVII. [4] Orat., xlii. 24. [5] Lib. XXVII.

plied: "He who will disinherit his son to make the Church his heir may seek another, not Augustine, to receive the inheritance: nay, God grant rather that he may find no one." The whole phenomenon of monasticism, also, though a one-sided protest against worldliness, shows that it was only a part of the Church that became enthralled with secular ambitions.

3. *A mixture of hierarchical pride and subserviency.* Apart from any connection between Church and State, the leading prelates would have experienced temptations to pride and ambition, incentives to magnify their office, and to pursue with vigor the race for episcopal pre-eminence. The new relations increased the tendencies in this direction only as increased resources and lessened spirituality were adapted to intensify an unsanctified thirst after distinction and power. The very same temper, however, which inclined ambitious prelates to strive after a pre-eminence over their associates in the Church, could move them to assume a very subservient attitude toward the sovereign. Few bishops had, as yet, the boldness to rebuke an emperor, and to discipline him ecclesiastically, — to say nothing about an endeavor to domineer over him in his own sphere. There were, indeed, many instances in which they refused, for conscience' sake, to obey his mandates. But, even while disobeying, they recognized their inability to cope with so powerful a rival, and contented themselves, for the most part, with a passive resistance to obnoxious decrees. The tendency, on the whole, was not so much to strive after superiority to the secular power, as to seek for support and advancement

through imperial favor and patronage. This was especially the case in the East; the development here was toward an emphatic subordination of Church to State. In the West, a higher degree of executive ability in Church officials, the early dissolution of the State, the remoteness of Rome from the Byzantine court, and the final abolition of all connection between the two, favored ecclesiastical independence, and prepard the way for a successful rivalry of the civil power. The more positive developments, however, in this direction, were subsequent to the present period.

4. *Limitation of religious freedom, both in theory and in practice.* Excommunication is the extreme penalty which the Church, by itself and as a purely religious organization, is competent to inflict. The co-operation or connivance of the State is needed for the visiting of any severer penalty. The presence of a Christian emperor upon the throne gave to the Church, for the first time, the opportunity to have force employed as a motive power in religion. Unhappily there was not enough of deep and enlightened conviction on the subject of tolerance thoroughly to discard the opportunity.

We find, it is true, very positive maxims concerning liberty of conscience. The strong utterances of eminent Fathers of the preceding period have their parallels in this. "It belongs to true piety," says Athanasius, "not to compel, but to convince, since the Lord Himself compelled no one, but left the decision to the free will of each, in that He said to all, 'If any man will come after me;' to His disciples, however, "Will ye also go

away?'"[1] "It is not permitted Christians," urged Chrysostom, "to overthrow error by constraint and violence: they are to work the salvation of men by persuasion, by reasoning, by gentleness."[2] From Hilary we have this earnest plea for religious liberty, addressed to the persecuting Constantius: "Watch," therefore, "and be intent that all your subjects may enjoy sweet freedom. In no way can disturbances be composed, and divisions healed, unless every one, free from all servile constraint, has full liberty to follow his own convictions. God is Lord of the universe, and does not need an enforced obedience, does not require an enforced confession."[3] Augustine, likewise, in his earlier utterances, advocated very distinctly the principles of tolerance. He urged that, in respect of the heathen, the great concern of Christians should be to destroy the idols in their hearts, since then of their own accord they would banish the outward abominations. We have also from him this compact statement of the sole efficiency of moral means in concerns of the soul: "Non vincit nisi veritas; victoria veritatis est caritas"[4] ("Nothing conquers but truth; the victory of truth is love").

It may, perhaps, be suggested, as a qualifying fact, that some of these statements came from a persecuted party. This is true. But some of them, on the other hand, came from men who had at the time no interest in tolerance, on personal grounds; and, as respects Athanasius and Hilary, it would be contrary to charity, perhaps also to reason, not to credit them with a gen-

[1] Hist. Arian., § 67. [2] In Sanct. Babylam.
[3] Ad Constant., Lib. I., §§ 2, 6.
[4] Quoted by Schaff, Church Hist., vol. iii., § 27.

uine and unselfish regard for religious liberty, at least to the extent of discountenancing force. Still, it is plain that the principle of religious tolerance had no such settled basis in the consciousness of the Church of that age as it finds to-day in the consciousness of Protestant Christendom. The same Chrysostom who so clearly urged the duty of loving heathen and heretics thought it allowable and incumbent upon himself to confiscate the churches of the Novatians and Quartodecimans.[1] Augustine in his later years, instigated by his failure to convert the Donatists by logic, as well as by the violent and miserable excesses of a fanatical wing of that party, virtually recalled his theory of freedom of conscience. His change of view is thus recorded by himself: "Originally my opinion was, that no one should be coerced into the unity of Christ, that we must act only by words, fight only by arguments, and prevail by force of reason, lest we should have those whom we knew as avowed heretics feigning themselves to be Catholics. But this opinion of mine was overcome, not by the words of those who controverted it, but by the conclusive instances to which they could point."[2] The "conclusive instances" referred to were instances of the practical efficiency of the imperial edicts in making Catholics of those who were previously Donatists. This revised theory was supported by Augustine with unhesitating zeal. Persecution, he argued, gains its character from its source and aim. For the good to persecute the wicked in order to make them good, serves a beneficent end. In the former age, Christianity suffered persecution from the ungodly; now it is her prerogative

[1] Socrates, Hist. Eccl., vi. 11. [2] Epist., xciii., § 17.

and duty to chastise the ungodly. Nebuchadnezzar casting those into the furnace who refused to worship the image which he had set up is the type of the unrighteous power which formerly held the throne of the Roman Empire; this same Nebuchadnezzar commanding the extermination of those who should speak slightingly of the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego is the type of righteous power in the hands of Christian emperors.[1] Augustine also appealed to the New Testament, claiming that the words in Luke xiv. 23, about compelling the invited guests to come in, authorizes the use of external pressure upon the refractory.[2] The conversion of Paul, he maintained, was an illustration of the policy inculcated in this passage, since the stubborn Pharisee was first struck down and blinded, before he received the comforting message of grace.[3] Augustine, indeed, had too much sense to imagine that genuine faith can be evolved by mere force. His idea was, that the rod of temporal severity may bring men to that subdued and considerate state of mind which tends to make them receptive of the rational evidences of truth. It was understood by him, moreover, that coercive measures must be dictated by the principle of love; and he seems to have advised that they should stop short of capital inflictions.[4] His theory, nevertheless, was an open door to the abuse of power. The most remorse-

[1] Epist., xciii., § 9.

[2] De Correctione Donat., § 24; Epist., xciii., § 5; Epist., clxxiii., § 10.

[3] Epist., xciii., clxxiii. It is strange that Augustine did not see that prerogatives of discipline which are safe in the hands of infinite wisdom and love cannot safely be put into the hands of fallible, selfish, passionate mortals.

[4] Epist., c.

less bigot could not wish for a more ample dogmatic basis of spiritual despotism than that supplied by the great theologian. "Augustine founded," says Neander, "the theory of the *coge* or *compelle intrare in ecclesiam.* It is true, that Augustine always explains that every thing must proceed solely from the feeling of love; but what availed this principle in connection with a theory which gave free play to all manner of caprice? How often has the holy name of love been misused by fanaticism and thirst for dominion! A theory was asserted and founded by Augustine, which, although ameliorated in practice by his pious and benevolent disposition, contained, nevertheless, the germ of the whole system of spiritual despotism, intolerance, and persecution, even to the tribunal of the Inquisition."[1]

The statute-book of the Empire early corresponded with the final theory of Augustine. The Theodosian and Justinian codes record successive acts by which religious privileges were denied to heretics, and civil disabilities were imposed upon them.[2] Legislation was especially severe against the Manichæans: the teaching and practice of their religion was made a capital offence.

The extent to which these intolerant principles were carried out in practice depended largely upon the temper of the emperor. Constantine was personally inclined to a liberal policy; but even he set the example

[1] Kirchengeschichte, iii. 314.

[2] See Codex Theod., Lib. XVI., Tit. v., and Codex Justin., Lib. I., Tit. v. Justinian even thought it necessary to make a special discrimination against female heretics, and ordained that they should have no part in the enlarged privileges which his laws secured to women. (*Novella* cix.)

of banishing heretical and refractory ecclesiastics, and gave schismatic parties to understand that they were to expect no countenance from the government. Constantius and others carried out proscriptive measures on a wider scale. Still there was a shrinking from the execution of heretics. The main endeavor was to constrain them to submission by threats and hardships. Instances in which the death penalty was formally and judicially visited for the simple crime of heresy were not numerous in the present period. According to Sozomen, Valens ordered a deputation of eighty ecclesiastics, who came to him to complain of grievances, to be executed, and their death was actually compassed; though the prefect had the prudence to disguise the atrocity by putting them on board a ship which might appear to perish by an accidental ignition.[1] Gibbon suspects that this account has been colored by the strong abhorrence which many entertained for Valens, and that it was really an accident by which the unfortunate ecclesiastics perished.[2] Be this as it may, we can hardly point to this as a case of the judicial infliction of capital punishment for religious beliefs, though the victims may have been obnoxious to Valens largely on the score of their theological affiliations. The capital sentence, if indeed he issued such in the case, was but the offspring of a sudden and passionate freak of a tyrant. Perhaps the first deliberate execution on the mere ground of heresy was that of the Spanish bishop Priscillian, and six adherents of his, at Treves in 385. These were charged with holding Manichæan tenets; and Maximus, who was then ruling in the West, at the

[1] Hist. Eccl., vi. 14. [2] Chap. xxv.

instigation of the bishop Ithacius, caused them to be put to death. The bloody deed found for the time being little applause in the Church. Ambrose of Milan and Martin of Tours entered against it their emphatic protest.[1] Less than a century after their day, however, Leo the Great referred with seeming approbation to this crude and detestable method of guarding the faith.[2]

The State, on its part, was not a little modified by its alliance with the Church. Among the principal results were the following: —

(1) *An associate power capable of restraining, though sometimes encouraging, despotism.* Custom early awarded to the bishops a kind of tribune function. They were expected to serve as patrons of the suffering and defenceless, thus supplementing the office of the churches as asylums for those threatened with sudden violence. Sometimes a resolute prelate was able to interpose successfully against the violence of the sovereign himself. The aged Flavian, for example, saved Antioch from the intemperate vengeance which it was expected a recent uproar would call down upon the city from the hand of Theodosius. Still more noteworthy was the tribute to spiritual authority which Ambrose obtained from the same emperor. Theodosius, with all his magnanimity, entertained a slumbering element of savage ferocity, which was liable, under great provocation, to break forth with volcanic energy. Such a provocation was offered when the populace of Thessalonica engaged in an utterly causeless sedition, and murdered officers

[1] Ambrose, Epist., xxiv., xxvi.; Sulpicius Severus, Hist. Sacra, ii. 50.
[2] Epist., xv.

highly esteemed by the Emperor. In the fury of his vengeance, Theodosius allowed his soldiers to fall upon the defenceless people; and several thousands, irrespective of guilt or innocence, were cut down. It was an occasion for the voice of a Nathan to be heard. In Ambrose the Church had its Nathan. He directed the Emperor to the crime of David, and exhorted him, as he had rivalled the sin of Israel's king, to imitate also his deep penitence.[1] For eight months the intrepid bishop kept the door of the Church closed against the imperial transgressor. Theodosius, on his part, humbly accepted the required penance for his cruel deed, and, moreover, passed a law which should stand as a safeguard against the sacrifice of the innocent by requiring the death-sentence to be delayed a certain interval. The fearless prelate had his reward even in the estimate of the humbled Emperor. "It is not easy to find," remarked Theodosius on a subsequent occasion, "a man capable of teaching me the truth. Ambrose alone deserves the title of bishop."[2] Chrysostom in Constantinople was another example of moral fearlessness in the face of imperial misdeeds. His daring, perhaps to a degree inconsiderate, arraignment of court practices, was one cause of the misfortunes which clouded the end of his life. Other instances might be noted; such as the excommunication by Synesius, Bishop of Ptolemais in Upper Libya, of an arbitrary and obdurate governor. Indeed, while the hierarchy may be charged with having provoked many excesses, it must be allowed the praise, to some extent, of having put a beneficent curb upon the temporal power.

[1] Epist., li. [2] Theodoret, Hist. Eccl., v. 18.

(2) *Improved laws.* During the first three centuries, some noteworthy reforms occurred in the Roman laws. These, though largely such as heathen statesmanship by its own interior development might gradually have wrought, were likely due in some degree to the indirect influence of Christianity. Moral forces are exceedingly subtle; and it is not at all incredible that the influence of the gospel should have penetrated, in some measure, even to the legislation of a hostile empire.

Under the Christian emperors, though reform stopped short of the proper goal, there was from the outset an impulse toward a higher justice and a more thorough respect for human rights. Greater privileges were accorded to women. An edict of Constantine granted them the same right in respect to the control of property as was enjoyed by males, with the exception that they could not sell landed estates without a special permission. Theodosius ordained that the mother should have the prerogative of guardianship in certain cases; namely, when there was no legal guardian at hand, and she, being of age, was willing to bind herself not to marry.[1]

Laws were passed at various times designed to limit, and ultimately to abolish, the infamous trade in female virtue.[2] Attempts in this direction, however, were only partially successful. The same may be said of the endeavors to give better security to the sanctity of the marriage relation. Laws were passed against concubinage;[3] severe penalties were attached to the crime

[1] Codex Justin., Lib. V., Tit. xxxv. 2.
[2] Codex Theod., XV., viii. 1, 2, [3] Codex Justin., V., xxvi.

of rape and adultery[1]; and attempts were made at different times to limit the practice of divorce by making it allowable only on occasion of gross crimes.[2] But the current of a corrupt society was too strong for the legislator, and, instead of being held in check by the laws, caused them in more than one instance to be relaxed.

Laws were passed in favor of children, carrying still farther the limitation of the old paternal absolutism which preceding heathen emperors had begun to restrict. The exposing of children was forbidden. The right to sell them on the ground of poverty, or any other plea, was abolished by Theodosius.[3] Children thus sold into slavery were declared free, and the purchaser who had used a free child as a slave could claim no recompense. In this relation, however, he had largely been anticipated by heathen legislation. The stealing of children for the purpose of enslaving them was made by Constantine a capital offence.[4]

Slaves failed to receive the same honor before the State as before the Church. Laws unjustly discriminating against them were left upon the statute-book. Still, their condition was ameliorated in various respects. The laws aimed to relieve them from the necessity of taking a degrading part in certain public amusements. The general policy of the government was favorable to their manumission. Even in the time of Constantine, as already indicated, a solemn religious sanction was given to the act of manumission by the provision that it might take place in church and on

[1] Codex Justin., I., iii. 54; Codex Theod., IX., xxiv., xxv.
[2] Codex Theod., III., xvi. [3] Ibid., III., iii. [4] Ibid , IX., xvii.

Sunday.[1] Certain services to the State were allowed to establish a title to freedom. Ordination to the ministry, with the consent of a master, was counted a declaration of emancipation.[2] Jews and pagans were denied legal right to hold a Christian slave.[3] As to the number who received their liberty, we have the testimony of Salvianus, in the fifth century, that manumission was of daily occurrence.[4]

Laws were passed designed to prevent unnecessary suffering on the part of criminals. An edict against gladiatorial combats was issued by Constantine in 325;[5] but no decisive progress was made toward their suppression till the early part of the fifth century, when a decree was re-enforced and made effective by the blood of the martyr. The circumstances, as given by Theodoret, were these: "A certain man named Telemachus, who had embraced a monastic life, came from the East to Rome at a time when these cruel spectacles were being exhibited. After gazing upon the combat from the amphitheatre, he descended into the arena, and tried to separate the gladiators. The sanguinary spectators, possessed by the demon who delights in the effusion of blood, were irritated at the interruption of their cruel sports, and stoned him who had occasioned the cessation. On being apprised of this circumstance, the admirable Emperor [Honorius] numbered him with the victorious martyrs, and abolished these iniquitous spectacles."[6]

As an estimate, by a very careful and well-informed

[1] Codex Theod., II., viii. 1.
[2] Justinian, Novella cxxiii.
[3] Codex Justin., I., iii. 56.
[4] Adv. Avaritiam, iii. 7.
[5] Codex Theod., XV., xii. 1.
[6] Hist. Eccl., v. 26.

writer, of the laws of the Empire under Christian rule, we may quote the following: "The legislation exhibits not yet the character of a complete whole, of a scientific unity; still, the reformatory action of Christianity is clearly apparent. It left therein indelible traces of the spirit of love and equity which God, through Jesus Christ, has disseminated in the world. At the time of the fall of the Empire of the Occident, the relations of civil society have already become fundamentally changed; the pitiless egoism and the aristocratic asperity of heathen antiquity have been eliminated from most of the laws. If these progressive victories of love allowed traces of the old jurisprudence still to remain, this was due to the fact that the last days of a world in process of downfall were not favorable to the revision of the statute-book. Justinian carried forward the remodelling of the jurisprudence, as far as this was possible in a time of stormy transition. He fixed the code for a series of centuries; and so the Roman jurisprudence survived, not as Roman jurisprudence in the old sense, but as Roman jurisprudence modified by Christianity. The Middle Ages, and later the immortal author of the civil code [the first Napoleon], completed the reform." [1]

[1] C. Schmidt, Essai Historique sur la Société Civile dans le Monde Romain.

CHAPTER II.

CHRISTIANITY ON AND BEYOND THE BORDERS OF THE EMPIRE.

1. Arabia. — The nomadic life prevailing in a large part of this country was a great hinderance in the way of its thorough evangelization. Still some, the monks in particular, were able to win converts. In the latter part of the fourth century the Saracen queen Mavia inserted among the conditions of peace with the Romans the requirement that a certain monk by the name of Moses should be constituted the bishop of her people.[1] According to Theodoret, the stylite Symeon had great celebrity among the Saracen nomads, and influenced many of them to accept of Christian baptism.[2]

In Arabia Felix, a work of some importance was accomplished by Theophilus, a native of the island Diu, but educated at Constantinople. Through his influence a prince embraced Christianity, and several churches were established. The good-begun work, however, finally succumbed to the opposition of the Jews, who were especially powerful in that region.[3]

2. Armenia and its Neighborhood. — The efficient activity of the Armenian Gregory, beginning in the

[1] Rufinus, Hist. Eccl., ii. 6; Socrates, iv. 36; Sozomen, vi. 38; Theodoret, iv. 23.

[2] Hist. Relig., xxvi.

[3] Philostorgius, Hist. Eccl., iii. 4, 5.

early part of the fourth century, secured quite a general spread of the gospel in his fatherland, and brought also the king to be numbered with the converts. Near the commencement of the fifth century, Miesrob gave the Armenians a Bible in their own language, and inaugurated a native Christian literature. The latter part of this century, however, was a period of disruption to the Armenian Church, on account of the invasions of the Persians, their policy of repression, and resulting commotions and wars of religion.

The origin of the Church among the Iberians, a people to the north of the Armenians, is one among many examples recorded of the power of humble means and seemingly chance incidents to spread the gospel. During the reign of Constantine, a Christian woman was carried into their country as a captive, and attracted attention by her pure and abstinent life. A peculiar custom of the country — namely, that of carrying a sick child about to the houses of neighbors in order that they might prescribe remedies — brought her still further to notice. Being solicited in such case, she replied that she had no remedy to prescribe, but that Christ, her God, was able to heal where man could not. She therefore simply prayed for the child, and its restored health was attributed to the virtue of her prayers. Later, the queen, who had heard of the incident, while suffering from a severe illness, summoned the Christian for her relief. The humble woman, not wishing to put herself forward as a wonder-worker, declined to go. The queen then ordered herself to be carried into her presence. The Christian prayed, and again recovery of the sick followed her petition. The queen now

confessed her adherence to Christianity; the king was also converted soon after, and both turned themselves to the instruction of their people. The seed thus sown was fostered by teachers sent from the Roman Empire.[1]

3. PERSIA. — Christianity numbered a considerable body of adherents in Persia at the beginning of the fourth century. The conversion at this time of one of the most learned of the magi, and his writings and disputations against the Persian faith, gave a fresh impulse to the Christian cause. He was made, however, to atone for his zeal and success by the martyr death; and near the middle of the century the whole Church in Persia was subjected to a fierce ordeal, a persecution which in violence and persistence reminds of the attempts of Roman power to exterminate Christianity. Both political and religious motives were among the causes. Jealousy of the neighboring power of the Christian emperors led to questionings over the loyalty of the Persian Christians. At the same time the magi spared no pains to stir up hatred on religious grounds. Beginning with the imposition of an exorbitant tax, the king next issued an edict for the execution of the ministry of the first three ranks. The aged bishop Symeon, the most eminent among the clergy, and a hundred priests with him, were executed upon a single occasion. Then followed a decree commanding all Christians to be cast into chains, and to be capitally punished. Many, from all ranks, witnessed their devo-

[1] Rufinus, Hist. Eccl., i. 10. Compare Socrates, i. 20; Sozomen, ii 7; Theodoret, i. 24.

tion to Christ by their blood, during the forty years of this persecution.[1]

A period of comparative tolerance followed; but in the year 418 the fanatical zeal of a bishop by the name of Abdas, in destroying a pyrœum, or temple dedicated to the worship of fire, caused another outbreak of persecution. "From this act of Abdas," says Theodoret, "arose a tempest which raged with violence against all persons of piety, and which lasted no less than thirty years. Its violence and long duration were mainly occasioned by the magi."[2]

In the Christological controversies, the Persian Christians sided finally with the proscribed Nestorians. The separation thus caused between them and their brethren of the Roman Empire greatly modified the political motive for persecution, and so contributed to the security of the Church in Persia.

4. India. — The accounts of Christianity in India in this period are well nigh as unsatisfactory as those of the previous centuries. The term is still used to include very much territory beside India proper. Thus, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret designate as India a country which is now commonly understood to have been Abyssinia. It is known, however, that commercial relations subsisted at this time between the more western countries and East India. There are also accounts of Persian Christians having penetrated into this region. It is possible, moreover, that the mission to Indian lands, which Philostorgius[3] ascribes to the Theophilus mentioned above, concerned the same region. If this sup-

[1] Sozomen, ii. 9-14. [2] Hist. Eccl., v. 39. [3] Hist. Eccl., iii. 5.

position be accepted, it must be concluded that the gospel reached India at quite an early period; for Theophilus represents that Christianity had long been established in the country to which he came. It would be still an open question, however, as to whether natives, as well as colonists and traders, composed the societies of Christians in that region.

5. Abyssinia. — In the reign of Constantine, a philosopher from Tyre, by the name of Meropius, while on a voyage in the interest of science, touched upon the coast of Abyssinia. The hostile natives murdered him and his whole crew, with the exception of two youths, Frumentius and Edesius. By their superior ability, they established themselves in the friendship of the king, and were promoted to positions of trust and honor. Meanwhile, they were not forgetful of the faith of their early years, and used their opportunity to introduce Christianity. About 326, Frumentius found his way to Alexandria, and was there, by Athanasius, ordained Bishop of Abyssinia.[1] Thus originated a church which has given a home to Christianity in Abyssinia, though in a very corrupt form, until the present time.

6. The Region of the Goths. — Before the time of Constantine, the warlike excursions of the Goths, especially into Cappadocia, and the captives whom they carried back with them, served in some degree to introduce Christianity among them. Already at the council of Nicæa we find a certain Theophilus who was styled

[1] Rufinus, Hist. Eccl., i. 9; Socrates, i. 19; Sozomen, ii. 34; Theodoret, i. 23.

Bishop of the Goths. But the most noted of the early laborers among this people was Ulfilas. Having served as a bishop in their land for several years about the middle of the fourth century, he was forced by persecution to flee across the Danube. By the favor of Constantius, a refuge on Roman soil was provided for him and the Goths who accompanied him. Later, the irruption of the Huns occasioned a new and larger Gothic influx. For forty years Ulfilas is said to have fulfilled the office of bishop among this people. One great monument of his life-work was his translation of the Bible into the Gothic language, the Books of Kings (including those of Samuel) excepted. According to Philostorgius, these books were omitted as being too agreeable to the warlike temper of the nation.[1] The persecution which drove out Ulfilas was renewed some years later, and Gothic devotion won its crown of martyrdom.

By Ulfilas and his school, Christianity was taught in the form of Arianism, or, more strictly speaking, semi-Arianism; but the orthodox faith also had its representatives among the Goths. Chrysostom took an especial interest in their Christian education. As Bishop of Constantinople, he designated a church for a Gothic service, and astonished the proud metropolitans by the spectacle of the barbarians expounding the mysteries of Holy Writ in their own language.[2]

7. Ireland. — Christianity had made good progress among the Britons in England and on the southern border of Scotland, while yet the people of northern

[1] Hist. Eccl., ii. 5. [2] Theodoret, Hist. Eccl., v. 30.

Scotland and of Ireland remained heathen. It was not till the fifth century that a thorough beginning was made of the evangelization of the Irish race. That beginning was due to the zeal and heroism of Patricius, or Patrick, the "Apostle of Ireland." To be sure, he was not the first regular missionary to the island. He had been preceded by a certain Palladius, who had entered upon the mission under the sanction of the Roman bishop Celestine. Little, however, is known of the work of Palladius. The results of his labors were probably not very great, and the honor of founding the Irish Church may well be accorded to his successor. The question of Patrick's birthplace is not very definitely answered. Professor Todd gives his verdict for Dumbarton, on the Firth of Clyde, as being decidedly favored by ancient traditions.[1] Lanigan, on the other hand, from a consideration of the names contained in the writings of Patrick, makes out a very plausible case for Boulogne-sur-Mer, in northern France.[2] According to the "Confession," and the "Epistle concerning Coroticus," both of which are considered genuine writings of Patrick, his father was a deacon, and, in civil standing, a decurion. While yet a youth, Patrick was taken captive by a plundering band and carried into the north of Ireland. "I was then," he writes in his "Confession," "nearly sixteen years old. I knew not the true God; and I was carried into captivity to Hiberio, with many thousands of men, according to our deserts, because we had gone back from God, and had not kept His commandments, and were not obedient to our priests, who

[1] J. H. Todd, St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland.
[2] John Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, chap. iii.

used to warn us for our salvation." Captivity proved a profitable discipline spiritually. While tending the cattle of the chief to whom he had been sold, Patrick felt his heart drawn out in prayer to God, and experienced the consoling sense of His presence. At length, after six years of exile and slavery, Providence prepared his deliverance. Following the direction of a voice which seemed to assure him in his sleep that the ship was ready which was destined to restore him to his own country, he hastened toward the coast, and made good his escape.

After a series of years, he felt a burden laid upon him to return to the land of his captivity and to labor for the salvation of its benighted people. His friends endeavored to dissuade him from such a project; but the Macedonian call sounding in his heart was too imperative to be neglected. "In the dead of night," he says, "I saw a man coming to me from Hiberio, whose name was Victoricus, bearing innumerable epistles. And he gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of it which contained the words, 'The voice of the Irish.' And, whilst I was repeating the beginning of the epistle, I imagined that I heard in my mind the voice of those who were near the wood of Fochlut, which is near the Western Sea. And thus they cried: 'We pray thee, holy youth, to come, and henceforth walk amongst us.' And I was greatly pricked in heart, and could read no more; and so I awoke."[1]

According to some quite early accounts, Patrick entered upon the Irish mission under the authority of the Roman bishop. But the evidence for this theory is un-

[1] Confession.

satisfactory. In neither of the genuine writings referred to is there any mention by the missionary of a communication with Rome; whereas, especially in case of the Confession, there was a distinct occasion to refer to such a communication had it taken place. In this writing he mentions his call to the Irish mission, and defends himself against the charge of presumption in having entered upon so great a work. How natural in such a relation to have quoted the sanction of the Roman bishop, if that had been among the antecedents of his enterprise! An equal silence respecting any connection with Rome is also observed by some of the earliest productions relating to Patrick, such as the Hymn of St. Secundinus, the Hymn of St. Fiacc, and the Life in the Book of Armagh. There is ground, therefore, to hold under suspicion, if not positively to deny, the theory of Roman patronage in connection with the mission. As Dr. Todd suggests, certain facts belonging to the history of Palladius may have been transferred by uncritical and interested biographers to the life of Patrick. But, whatever the relations of Patrick himself may have been, the relations of the early Irish Church with the Roman see do not appear to have been very intimate; for we find the Irish, like the Britons across the channel, cherishing non-Roman customs.[1]

Ireland, with its Druids and its turbulent and war-

[1] W. D. Killen calls attention to the fact that in all the correspondence of Leo the Great, who was a contemporary of Patrick, there is no mention of Ireland. He adds: "It is acknowledged that for one hundred and fifty years after the death of Leo, the Church of Ireland continued to be in a very flourishing condition; and yet there is not a shadow of evidence that meanwhile any bishop of Rome addressed to any of its ministers so much as a single line of advice, warning, or commendation." (*Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, i. 8, 9.)

like tribes, was a difficult field to bring under Christian cultivation. On more than one occasion the missionary found his life imperilled. Great success, nevertheless, attended his labors; and in his own person he accomplished much for that religious and intellectual regeneration of Ireland, which made this island a chief light in Europe in the period immediately following.

Authentic history says but little concerning Patrick, but it says enough to indicate the prominent traits in his character. We see in him a man distinguished by humility, simplicity, unselfish devotion, and large practical efficiency; a man very different from the pious monstrosity into which his image has been distorted by many ancient legends, and by some modern biographers who have overlooked the distinction between legend and history. A miscalculating fancy has clouded his fame in the attempt to magnify it by a list of ill-begotten marvels. So much the more, however, should the tribute be paid to him which is required by genuine history.

CHAPTER III.

DOCTRINAL CONTROVERSIES.

I.—CAUSES AND FEATURES.

EVEN general church history must take considerable note of the doctrinal controversies of this period. They entered too deeply into the life of the age, were too large a factor in the great events of the Christian Empire, that they should be left entirely to the history of doctrine. However, we shall endeavor to observe the distinction between the two branches, and without dwelling upon the minutiæ of doctrine, or the arguments adduced in their support, shall consider the controversies mainly as factors in the life and public events of the age.

The reign of Constantine inaugurated, almost of necessity, an era of theological activity, if not of theological strife. That the Church, when relieved of the strong outward pressure, should apply itself with great zeal to the deeper problems of the faith, was a very natural turn of events. Where there is mental life, there is always speculation in some department or other, always philosophizing, always endeavors after the exact definition and the satisfactory defence of truth. In the centuries following Constantine, philosophizing was drawn by an irresistible attraction into the theological

field. Christianity uplifting itself in the freshness and glory of a new and triumphant power, and claiming to be the absolute religion embracing the whole circle of divine truth, must necessarily absorb very much of the speculative energies of the times.

Indifference to matters of creed was practically an impossibility. Many whom custom still bound to their old, worn-out heathenism may have had but a moderate interest in its tenets. But Christianity with its unforgotten record of heroic conflicts, with its long list of honored martyrs, with its lofty promises, with its comparative freshness, and with its felt superiority to all the religious products of the ancient world, claimed too lively an interest from thoughtful adherents to allow of an indifferent attitude towards its doctrinal contents.

Aside from indifference to matters of creed, unanimity of opinion was the only thing which could have saved the Church of that era from doctrinal controversies. But this, too, was practically out of the question. The depth of the subject was enough by itself to prevent unanimity of opinion, especially on the part of men coming from such varied antecedents as belonged to the transition from a Jewish and heathen to a Christian world. There were causes, therefore, comparatively normal and legitimate, that acted powerfully in the direction of doctrinal agitation.

But these causes were re-enforced by others that have less claim upon our charity. A false impetus was given to theological strife by a wide-spread failure properly to recognize the broad distinction which exists between faith and orthodoxy. The abhorrence of heresy, which had been engendered by such gross aberrations from

Christian truth as Gnosticism and Manichæism, conjoined with the unspiritual temper of numerous adherents of the victorious Church, led not a few to confound evangelical belief with allegiance to a creed. According to their superficial estimate, a zealous championship of the right articles of faith was a supreme evidence of Christian character. Coalescing with this stimulus to controversy was the old Greek disputatiousness which still survived. It was easy for the Greek mind to run into a mania for speculation and discussion, to the neglect of practical interests. Cicero in his day complained of the controversial bias of the Greeks, and accused them of thirsting for contention rather than for truth. Not a little of this spirit came unconquered into the Church.

Controversy was also intensified and imbittered by the action of the government. The design of the emperors was indeed the promotion of peace and harmony in the Church, but their interference none the less bore the natural fruit of increased strife. What else could have been the result of the principle established under the administration of Constantine; namely, that the minority of bishops, gathered or represented in a council, must submit their faith to the decision of the majority, and, in case of refusal, feel the force of civil as well as of ecclesiastical proscription? The inevitable consequence was, that, when a doctrinal dispute arose, the partisans of either side were intent upon securing for themselves a majority in a council and the co-operation of the government. The government, thus flattered by the appeals of contending factions, was incited to make a full show of its power and importance. Emperors having least understanding of the subjects under debate

were quite apt to be most zealous in their attempts to control doctrinal settlements. Hence full scope was given, in the treatment of theological questions, to all the expedients of the most violent political strife.

Finally, the populace of the large cities, by their characteristic bias to faction and extreme partisanship, fostered controversy, and contributed to it an element of ferocity. "The abstruse tenets of the Christian theology," says Milman, "became the ill-understood, perhaps unintelligible watchwords of violent and disorderly men. The rabble of Alexandria and other cities availed themselves of the commotion to give loose to their suppressed passion for the excitement of plunder and bloodshed. If Christianity is accused as the immediate exciting cause of these disastrous scenes, the predisposing principle was in that uncivilized nature of man, which not merely was unallayed by the gentle and humanizing tenets of the gospel, but, as it has perpetually done, pressed the gospel itself, as it were, into its own unhallowed service." [1]

From all these causes resulted an age intensely polemical. As many testimonies and incidents assure us, controversial zeal burned with indescribable ardor. "Disputes and contentions," writes Theodoret, "arose in every city and in every village, concerning theological dogmas. These were indeed melancholy scenes over which tears might have been shed. For it was not as in bygone ages, when the Church was attacked by strangers and enemies: they who fought against each other [in this strife of tongues] were members of each other, and belonged to one body." [2] "Every thing in

[1] History of Christianity, Book III., chap. v. [2] Hist. Eccl., i. 6.

the city," says Gregory of Nyssa, speaking of the Arian controversy in Constantinople, "is full of such [as dogmatize over things incomprehensible], — the lanes, the markets, the avenues, the streets, the clothiers, the bankers, the dealers in provisions. When you ask one how much a thing costs, he will favor you with a discourse about the begotten and the unbegotten. When you inquire the price of bread, he replies, 'The Father is greater than the Son, and the Son is subordinate.' If you ask, 'Is the bath ready?' he declares, 'The Son was created from nothing.' I know not by what name, whether frenzy or madness or other kindred term, this evil which has come upon the people may fitly be called." [1] In like manner Gregory Nazianzen testifies: "It has gone so far that the whole market resounds with the discourses of heretics, every banquet is corrupted by this babbling even to nausea, every merry-making is transformed into a mourning, and every funeral solemnity is almost alleviated by this brawling as a still greater evil; even the chambers of women, the nurseries of simplicity, are disturbed thereby, and the flowers of modesty are crushed by this precocious practice of dispute." [2] If such language applies to the doctrinal strifes of the fourth century, what shall describe the polemic zeal of the fifth century? Said Nestorius in his inaugural sermon at Constantinople: "Give me, O Emperor, the earth purified from heretics, and I will give you heaven in return; help me to destroy the heretics, and I will help you to conquer the Persians." [3] But intolerant as was the zeal which these

[1] Orat. de Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti.

[2] Orat., xxvii. 2 (Schaff's rendering). [3] Socrates, Hist. Eccl., vii. 29.

words reveal, it by no means exceeded that which was directed against Nestorius himself as he fell under suspicion of heresy. At the council of Ephesus in 431, a whole string of anathemas was hurled against him. One bishop remarked, that, as those who counterfeit the imperial coins are deserving of the severest penalties, so Nestorius, who has dared to falsify the orthodox faith, was deserving of all punishments at the hands of God and of men. Another declared that he was worse than Cain and the Sodomites, and that the earth might fitly open to swallow him up, or fire from heaven descend upon him. In the official notification by the council of his condemnation, Nestorius was named a "new Judas;"[1] and the city of Ephesus expressed its delight over the sentence by processions, torches, and illuminations.[2] A layman and a lawyer, writing subsequently, named Nestorius "that God-assaulting tongue, that second conclave of Caiaphas, that work-shop of blasphemy."[3] Cyril of Alexandria, who was the soul of the crusade against Nestorius, scrupled at no means for securing his ends, even to the bribing of numerous court officials. The letters of his archdeacon show conclusively that he made presents to various parties at court, and exhorted the church at Constantinople to be careful to do their part in satisfying the avarice of certain persons.[4] Hefele attempts, indeed, to palliate the practice of Cyril, on the plea that it was Oriental custom to introduce a negotiation with a sovereign or other

[1] Mansi, Concilia, iv. 1228.
[2] Ibid., iv. 1241; Opera Cyrilli, Epist. xxiv (Migne).
[3] Evagrius, Hist. Eccl., i. 2.
[4] See Neander, iv. 203; also Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, § 156.

dignitaries with presents.[1] No doubt, in opening communication with a distant and comparatively unknown court, Oriental courtesy emphasized the propriety of making some gift. But who imagines that the custom of that day made it incumbent upon Cyril to accompany with a multitude of presents his approaches to his own government at Constantinople, with which he had already been in close communication? Judged by the nature and intent of the transactions, it was a gross case of bribery.[2] All that can be said is, that the conscience of the time was not fully up to the modern standard in its judgment of such practices. But, with all his unscrupulous and relentless ardor, Cyril scarcely represents the extreme of controversial heat. His successor Dioscurus surpassed him. The council of Ephesus, in 449, was ruled by him and his cohort of monks with all the arts of terrorism which might have been chosen by a military dictator. Flavian, the venerable patriarch of Constantinople, was set upon with such atrocity that he soon died from his injuries. Any opinion counter to the sentiment of the dominant party was greeted with a furious anathema. As words implying two natures

[1] § 150. Hefele seems half-conscious of the weakness of his apology, for he seeks to withdraw attention from Cyril by reference to the Protestant theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who prefaced their communications to the dignitaries of the Greek Church with presents. Supposing that the cases were parallel, it would do little toward rescuing the saintship of Cyril. But they are not parallel. If the Protestant theologians had beset the officials of their *own government* with lavish presents, in order to secure a special act of administration, such as vengeance upon a hated rival, there would have been a ground of comparison.

[2] That Cyril had gained a reputation for simony (Isidore of Pelusium, Epist., ii. 127), does not tend to soften the interpretation of these transactions.

in Christ were quoted from Eusebius of Dorylæum, a chorus of voices shouted, "Burn him alive! As he has divided Christ, so let him be divided!" In the rage for dogma, conduct was completely ignored. Charges of adultery and other crimes being brought against a bishop, Dioscurus answered, "If you have any accusation to prefer against the man's orthodoxy, we will receive charges; but we have not come here to pass sentence for adultery."[1] Even the honored and important council of Chalcedon often became a Babel of anathematizing voices. Violent invectives were liberally hurled. As the council made place for Theodoret, the party of Dioscurus cried out, "Cast out the Jew, the enemy of God!" To this the friends of Theodoret responded with the exclamation, "Cast out the disturber, cast out the murderer!" The fifth ecumenical council, held at Constantinople in 553, was not content with condemning merely living heretics: resorting to *ex post facto* decrees, it anathematized, on the score of doctrines not authoritatively settled in his day, Theodore of Mopsuestia, a man who had died long before in unquestioned fellowship with the Church. The West, as a general thing, did not proceed to quite the same extreme as the East, in this controversial era. Jerome, however, did not fall much below the Eastern standard. He stigmatized the opinions of Jovinian as the "hissings of the old serpent," and named him, though a monk, an Epicurus, because he opposed the current over-valuation of monasticism.[2] Of Vigilantius, he said that he might more properly be called Dormitantius, and intimated that his presence in Gaul had supplied a full compensation for

[1] So Theodoret reports, Epist., cxlvii. [2] Adv. Jovin., i. 4, ii. 36.

the lack of mythologic monsters in that country.[1] A still more signal exhibition of controversial rancour appears in his reference to Rufinus. At a time when the grave invited to charity, he wrote: "The scorpion is buried under the soil of Sicily, with Enceladus and Porphyrion; the many-headed hydra has ceased to hiss against us."[2]

Truly an unsightly picture is that which is formed from the combination of such features! Still, it would indicate a very superficial judgment, if these controversies should be regarded as unmeaning events and a total waste. The remark which has sometimes been handed about respecting the Arian controversy — namely, that the whole strife was over a mere *iota* — is very shallow, not to say utterly senseless; just as though the difference of a single letter may not make an immeasurable difference between the meanings of two words. Some of the subjects discussed were vitally related to a true conception of Christianity. Whatever of passion and intrigue may have mingled in the strife, there was still a strong current of fundamental thought, a genuine canvassing of truth upon its merits. While narrow and hot-headed partisans had their place, there were also in the field some of the ablest and noblest men whom God has given to the Church, men of invincible integrity and powerful intellects, such as Athanasius, Basil, the two Gregories, Hilary, and Augustine. A profound and honest engagement of mind was brought to bear upon the great problems of the Christian faith, and certain landmarks were set up for the guidance of all subsequent ages. Unseemly factors are likely to

[1] Cont. Vigilant. [2] Comm. in Ezech., Pref.

attach themselves to any great movement, as the Reformation clearly illustrates. This first polemical era in Christian history will compare not unfavorably with some later eras. Intolerant as was partisan zeal, there was a general hesitation before the shedding of blood. Some instances there were of deliberate cruelty at the hands of imperial or episcopal tyrants; but the shedding of blood was confined mainly to outbreaks of mob-like violence. There was no organized murder, no Saint Bartholomew massacre, no Spanish Inquisition, no sword of Alva reeking with the blood of thousands. The conditions of the age opened a wide field to bigoted zeal; but the same poison of bigotry is ever stealing into the human heart, and we scarcely need to go back of the present generation to find humiliating examples, though the more perfect checks in our times stand in the way of the more virulent outbreaks.

II.—THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

According to the Arian view, Christ was to be esteemed neither truly divine nor truly human, neither God nor man; but a being intermediate between the two, the first and most exalted of creatures, who at the fulness of time assumed a human body for the sake of man's redemption. Such a view as this had never been received in the Church with any favor, and indeed an exact parallel is not to be found among the preceding heresies.

Arius, who gave the name to this heresy, was a native of Libya, but came to reside at Alexandria as a presbyter of the Church there. He is described as tall and

thin, ascetic in habit, and possessed of considerable tact as a logician. About the year 320, his peculiar views had attracted sufficient attention to cause the summoning of a council of Egyptian and Libyan bishops, by which he and his followers were excommunicated. But Arius was not to be silenced. For the wider circulation of his views, he sent abroad his *Thaleia*, a work partly in prose and partly in verse. A few bishops were found to agree with his doctrine. Others, while not holding exactly his view of the nature of Christ, still favored such an emphatic subordination of the Son to the Father as to entertain much sympathy for him. Especially prominent among these was Eusebius of Nicomedia. Others, while they were not in doctrinal agreement with Arius, deprecated agitation, and thought it impolitic to press the case against him and his adherents. To many, however, the Arian view seemed an intolerable and blasphemous innovation. When, therefore, the attention of Constantine was called to the subject, he found a great agitation existing. Careful above all things for unity, he sought to allay the controversy, and to this end addressed a letter to the disputants in Egypt. He represented that there was no adequate cause, in the nature of the question at issue, for such fierce contention, and pointed to the example of philosophers, who could differ on individual tenets, and still maintain comparative harmony in view of the teachings held by them in common. But conviction and zeal had reached too high a pitch to be quieted by such means. Constantine felt obliged to turn to some more effective expedient, and at length fixed upon the idea of calling a general council. Invitations were sent

to bishops in different sections of the Empire, and means were liberally provided for conveying them to the point of meeting.

The council met and held its sessions at Nicæa in Bithynia in the summer of the year 325. According to Athanasius, with whose statements Socrates and Theodoret agree, three hundred and eighteen bishops were present. These constituted the council proper, the numerous presbyters and deacons who accompanied them not being accorded the privilege of voting. The Latin Church had but few delegates in the assembly, — only about a half dozen bishops, and two presbyters who served as representatives of Sylvester, the aged Bishop of Rome.

An assembly so largely representative of the Christian world, and meeting for the first time under the auspices of a Christian emperor, was naturally regarded as a very impressive spectacle. And truly the circumstances, as also the personal make-up of the council, endow it with a peculiar interest. The Church represented here was the Church of the persecutions, the Church which still bore the imprint of the blows dealt by heathen tyranny. "Many," says Theodoret, speaking of the assembled bishops, "like the holy apostles, bore in their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul, Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, a fortress situated on the banks of the Euphrates, had been deprived of the use of both hands by the application of a red-hot iron. Some had had the right eye torn out, others had lost the right arm. In short, it was an assembly of martyrs." [1]

Among the most august features, in the view of many,

[1] Hist. Eccl., i. 7.

was the presence of the Emperor. Eusebius, who is understood to have presented him the salutations of the bishops, records with evident delight the scene of his introduction to the council. After the entrance of several of his family and friends, "at last he himself proceeded through the midst of the assembly, like some heavenly messenger of God, clothed in raiment which glittered as it were with rays of light, reflecting the glowing radiance of a purple robe, and adorned with the brilliant splendor of gold and precious stones. He surpassed all present in height of stature and beauty of form, as well as in majestic dignity of mien and inimitable strength and vigor. All these graces, united to a suavity of manner and a serenity becoming his imperial station, declared the excellence of his mental qualities to be above all praise. As soon as he had advanced to the upper end of the seats, at first he remained standing; and, when a low chair of wrought gold had been set for him, he waited until the bishops had beckoned to him, and then sat down, and after him the whole assembly did the same."[1] After the address of Eusebius, the Emperor spoke to the assembly, re-affirming his desire for unity and concord in the Church. At a later stage of the proceedings, he gave an emphatic supplement to the main idea of this speech. Gathering up the accusations which quarrelsome persons had presented against certain bishops, he caused them to be burned openly, declaring at the same time upon oath that he had not read them. "He said that the crimes of priests ought not to be made known to the multitude, lest they should become an occasion of offence or of sin. He also said,

[1] Vita Cons., iii. 10.

that, if he had detected a bishop in the very act of committing adultery, he would have thrown his imperial robe over the unlawful deed."[1]

The discussions of the council revealed at once the existence of at least three parties: (1) the Arians; (2) those commonly ranked together as semi-Arians, though they represented opinions all the way from a near approach to Arianism to a near approach to orthodoxy; (3) the orthodox party, which might also be called the Nicene, inasmuch as it framed and championed the creed that was established by the council of Nicæa. The strict Arians constituted but a small minority. According to Sozomen, they numbered seventeen at the commencement of the council.[2] The semi-Arians, like the Arians, represented the Greek rather than the Latin Church, and revealed considerable numerical strength in the period following the council, whatever proportion they may have formed in the assembly at Nicæa. Little difficulty, however, was experienced in prevailing upon the great majority to sign the creed of the victorious or orthodox party. The essential feature of that creed was the safeguard against any denial of the Son's divinity which it provided, through the explicit statement that the Son is *homoousion*, or consubstantial, with the Father; not of an essence dissimilar to that of the Father, or even of an essence merely similar, but of the same essence. Only two of the assembled bishops, Theonas and Secundus, persistently refused to sign; and these were excommunicated and banished, together with Arius. Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis, while they subscribed the creed, refused to sanction the sentence

[1] Hist. Eccl., i. 11. [2] Hist. Eccl., i. 20.

against Arius. For this cause they were deposed and banished shortly after the adjournment of the council, but ere long were restored and regarded by Constantine with favor.

The council of Nicæa did not overthrow the heresy against which it passed sentence. To be sure, for the next quarter of a century or more, there was little exhibition of strict Arianism; and the numerous synods that were convened were characterized in general by its formal repudiation. The strict Arians, for the time being, disguised their sentiments, and trained under the banner of the semi-Arians. This latter party was highly successful in its endeavors after imperial patronage. Even before the death of Constantine, there were conspicuous tokens of its influence at court. Persistent attempts were made to poison the mind of Constantine against the most able champion of the Nicene creed, namely, Athanasius, who had become Bishop of Alexandria shortly after the adjournment of the council. Slanderous charges were urged, and finally had their desired effect (336) in securing the banishment of the iron-hearted bishop. Meanwhile, Arius had been recalled from banishment and restored to imperial favor, since he succeeded in convincing Constantine of his substantial agreement with the Nicene formula, and declared upon oath that he did not hold the faith for which he had been condemned. To complete his triumph and that of his friends, it only remained that he should formally be restored to church fellowship. But this was not to take place. As Athanasius relates, the partisans of Arius in Constantinople (in 336) were threatening that another day should not pass without seeing his

restoration accomplished. Greatly distressed at this turn of events, the bishop Alexander prostrated himself before God, and prayed that either he or Arius might be taken out of the world before ever the Church should be profaned by the presence of the heretic. The petition was speedily answered. "For the sun had not gone down, when Arius, compelled by necessity to go into a place of retirement, fell down there, and in a moment was deprived both of communion and of life."[1]

Under Constantius, the semi-Arians were still more influential; indeed, they advanced to an apparent ascendency. Their ascendency, however, corresponded to the means by which it was obtained, and was rather external than internal and substantial. The testimony of such witnesses as Athanasius, as well as other evidences, makes it quite evident that in this controversy the opponents of orthodoxy were peculiarly distinguished by craft and violence. Milman, notwithstanding his lack of fervent admiration for the Athanasian cause, assents to this conclusion. "The Arian party," he says, "independent of their speculative opinions, cannot be absolved from the unchristian heresy of cruelty and revenge. However darkly colored, we cannot reject the general testimony to their acts of violence, wherever they attempted to regain their authority."[2] In the opinion of Baur, also, the Arian party

[1] Epist. ad Episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ, § 19. Compare Epist. ad Serapion; Rufinus, Hist. Eccl., i. 13; Socrates, i. 38; Sozomen, ii. 29, 30.

[2] History of Christianity, Book III., chap. v. The preceding remark is not intended to imply that Milman shows lack of sympathy for the Nicene faith. The basis of the remark is his representation that Athanasius was extra rigorous in insisting upon the orthodox shibboleth, the word *homoousion*.

had an overweening confidence in external means, and was far less distinguished by a truly religious interest than the Nicene party. "On the side of the Arians," he says, "the religious and dogmatic interest was ever subordinate to the political, and, as the whole period covered by the reigns of Constantine and Constantius shows, was interwoven with a whole series of machinations and court intrigues."[1]

The tyrannical pressure of Constantius drove the Nicene party into the shade, and caused not a few instances of defection within its ranks. But unflinching advocates still sustained its cause. Athanasius, in particular, was unmoved by the storm of adversity, and his ardor was in no wise cooled by his repeated experience of banishment. This outward defeat of the Nicene party, however, prepared for the overthrow of the opposing forces. As the victory against the former appeared secure, the latter began to break ranks. The strict Arians thought it no longer necessary to train under the banner of the semi-Arians, and began to give open and definite expression of their sentiments. Aëtius and his disciple Eunomius, who were prominent among the later champions of that cause, taught Arianism in terms more disparaging to the nature of the Son than Arius himself had presumed to employ. This naturally alienated the semi-Arians; and, as they were made to feel the pressure of an Arian persecution at the hands of Valens, they found it easy to coalesce with the orthodox, from whom, indeed, a section of their party had never been very widely separated as respects doctrinal beliefs. The victory, therefore, had already been prepared for

[1] Dogmengeschichte.

orthodoxy when the second ecumenical council assembled at Constantinople, in the year 381, under the auspices of the Emperor Theodosius. By that council the Nicene creed was successfully re-affirmed. Arianism appeared thereafter as a vanquished foe, and found little place except among certain of the barbarian tribes, in whose midst it maintained itself till the sixth century.

III.—THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES.

Before the three-score years of struggle with Arianism had come to a close, another controversy arose, involving still more prolonged agitations,—indeed, invading the peace of the Church more or less for the space of three centuries. This was the controversy concerning the person of Christ, concerning the presence and the relation of the divine and the human in Him. Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea in Syria, introduced the first stage in this long contention by his teaching that the pre-existent Logos took the place of the rational soul in Christ, so that His incarnation involved no assumption of this part of human nature. The theory of Apollinaris was denounced in different quarters, and finally received an authoritative condemnation from the council of Constantinople in 381.

It was not, however, till the early part of the fifth century that the more turbulent era of the Christological controversy was introduced. The strife which then arose, so far as it was not the product of mere personal rivalries and ambitions, had its source in the diverse spirit and tendencies of the Antiochian and the Alexandrian schools. The former, which counted among

its exponents Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, was distinguished by its bent to sober and critical exegesis. This naturally made them observant of the extent to which the New Testament ascribes to the Redeemer the purely human as well as the divine. They accordingly gave emphasis to the human factor, and distinguished broadly between the two natures in Christ. The Alexandrian school, on the other hand, had a leaning toward mysticism, was disposed to emphasize the divine in Christ, and dwelt rather upon the thorough union of the human with the divine than upon the distinction between the two natures. Neither of these tendencies necessarily involved positive heresy, but it was easy for either to pass on to an heretical extreme.

These two schools came to a collision in the persons of Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, and Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople. To neither of these can an unqualified sympathy be awarded. In personal character Nestorius was doubtless superior to the ambitious, unscrupulous, vengeful Cyril; but he, too, was a very self-assertatory and unfair disputant. Each placed the worst construction upon the statements of the other; and, pursuing this method, each had about equal ground for casting the odium of heresy upon the other. If the worst construction of some of the sentences of Nestorius involves him in the error of compromising the unity of Christ's person, no less does the worst construction of some of Cyril's sentences involve him in the error of confounding the two natures in Christ.[1]

[1] Cyril, in the third of his Twelve Anathemas, speaks of the divine and the human in Christ as being combined in ἕνωσιν φυσικὴν. In Epist. xl., Ad Acacium, after remarking that ideally, or in conception, we may

If Cyril ought not to be charged with this error, equally well may Nestorius be acquitted of consciously entertaining the heresy charged against him. No doubt he had not arrived at the most finished and guarded statement of the subject of Christology. But, on a question so little developed as was this at that time, the intent of a man is not to be judged by the extreme of the consequences toward which his position might be regarded as tending. Defective statement and lack of complete mental consistency are quite different from a clear and decided apprehension and advocacy of an heretical tenet. That Nestorius was guilty of the latter, is unproved. Certainly his disinclination to apply to Mary the term *theotokos* (Mother of God), which was the grand occasion of the crusade against him, is no adequate proof against his orthodoxy. For, as Nestorius explained, his objection to this term lay in the unseemly heathenish assumption which it might convey respecting the parentage of Deity. Moreover, he expressed himself as willing to accept the term on condition that it should be guarded from the obnoxious sense. But the crusade had been begun. Cyril was supported by the Roman bishop, and was determined that Nestorius should be humbled. In the council convened at Ephesus in 431, he secured the emphatic condemnation of Nestorius,

speak of two natures having been united in Christ, he adds, "But after the union, as if now the division into two were taken away, we believe that there is one nature of the Son," — *μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἕνωσιν, ὡς ἀνῃρημενης ἤδη γε τῆς εἰς δύο διατομῆς, μίαν πιστεύομεν τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ φύσιν.* Cyril may have made some statements which modified the natural significance of these expressions. But his phraseology was decidedly objectionable, and the art of the interpreter is quite as much needed to save his orthodoxy as it is to rescue that of Nestorius.

though at the expense of an unseemly haste in anticipating the arrival of the Oriental bishops. This slight occasioned a schism in the council. The coveted vengeance upon Nestorius was also delayed by the reluctance of the Emperor to sacrifice the patriarch with whom he had held friendly relations; but at length, in 435, Cyril was gratified by the banishment of his hated rival. Two or three years before, a supplement had been made to the unfinished work of the council of Ephesus by the adoption of a creed designed to reconcile contending parties. This creed, which was signed by Cyril among others, affirmed the term *theotokos*, but at the same time was careful to affirm two natures in Christ. It was a creed which, as Neander and Gieseler state, could have been signed by Nestorius without the sacrifice of a conscientious scruple.

Nestorius died in exile. But the victory over him had its offset. A schism arose that has never been healed. While denied tolerance under Christian emperors, the sect of the Nestorians found refuge in Persia. They were quite flourishing for several centuries, but suffered greatly from the terrible ravages of Tamerlane, near the end of the fourteenth century. A branch of them, known as the "Thomas Christians," became established in India.

The bent of the Alexandrian school toward the opposite of the heresy with which Nestorius was charged was revealed soon after his condemnation. The doctrine of Eutyches, a monk of Constantinople, that there is only one nature in Christ (the human in Him being assimilated to the divine, and His body being of different substance from that of ours), though condemned

in Constantinople, met with a sympathetic response in Alexandria. Dioscurus, the successor of Cyril, was the leading spirit in the synod of Ephesus in 449, and that synod asserted the orthodoxy of Eutyches.

Two years later the council of Chalcedon was convened. This was the most important council of the early Church which passed decisions upon the subject of Christology. Its creed, based largely upon the epistle of Leo the Great to Flavian, marked an era in the development of the doctrine of Christ's person. On the one hand, it repelled the error of separating too widely between the two natures of Christ; on the other, it repudiated the error of mingling and confounding the two natures. It asserted that the human and the divine are each entire in the Redeemer, and that each retains its distinctive nature, while yet the two belong to one and the same person. The natures are two, the personality is one.

The Monophysites, as the advocates of the doctrine of only one nature in Christ came to be called, were by no means satisfied with the creed of Chalcedon, or disposed to acknowledge its authority. In Egypt the malcontents formed a numerous body. They had also a considerable representation in Palestine, Syria, and some other regions. Various attempts were made to bring about their reconciliation. The Emperors Zeno and Justinian manœuvred, to a conspicuous degree, for this end. Under the latter a new ecumenical council was convened, that of Constantinople, in 553. This council paid a species of tribute to the Monophysites, in that it reflected upon those most hated by them, passing anathemas against the person of Theodore of

Mopsuestia and certain writings of Theodoret and Ibas. It had no perceptible effect, however, toward the pacification of the Monophysites, and they settled into the condition of permanent schism. The principal branches or sects of the schismatics were the Jacobites (in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia), the Armenians, the Copts of Egypt, and, in close relation with these last, the Abyssinians.[1] The Maronites, dwelling in the Lebanon region, were an offshoot of the closing era of the Christological controversies in the seventh century.

[1] The Jacobites are so called from their distinguished leader and episcopal head, Jacob, surnamed Baradai or Zanzalus, whose extraordinary activity, in the sixth century, saved the persecuted Monophysites of Syria from threatened extinction. The schismatic position of the Armenians was assumed about the middle of the sixth century, shortly after their country passed under Persian rule. For a long time they have occupied the first rank among these sects, in point of numbers and influence. One branch of the Armenians, since the union effort put forth at the council of Florence, in the fifteenth century, has been connected with the Church of Rome. The Egyptian Monophysites, or the Copts, too numerous to be repressed, and persistent in their opposition to the council of Chalcedon, had their own patriarch and separate ecclesiastical organization after the year 536. The Mohammedan conquest in the next century, which their hatred of the Catholics much facilitated, resulted in a great reduction of their strength. They have survived, however, till the present day. One peculiar feature of this communion is its strong Jewish tinge. Circumcision is practised, and the Mosaic distinction of meats observed. An equal or even greater affiliation with Jewish custom characterizes the daughter-church of Abyssinia, which confesses its subordination in receiving its episcopal head by the choice of the Coptic patriarch. By the Abyssinian Christians the Jewish sabbath, as well as the Lord's Day, is observed. The ark has a prominent place in their worship. Among the Monophysite sects they probably represent the extreme of ignorance, ceremonialism, and superstition, though all of these bodies are in sore need of a spiritualizing and vitalizing reform.

IV.—ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.

Outside the main current of the great doctrinal interests, but still causing no little agitation, were the Origenistic controversies.[1] These arose from the very diverse estimates that were passed by different parties upon the distinguished Alexandrian. While broad-minded men, like Athanasius, were able to draw from Origen without blindly following him, or to reject certain of his teachings without uttering wholesale anathemas, men of narrow mind were inclined to run to the one or the other extreme. Conspicuous among the fanatical opponents of Origen was Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus. In 394 he stirred up a controversy on the subject in Palestine, where he won Jerome to his side. Rufinus, on the other hand (who was also in Palestine at that time), refused to take sides against Origen. The result was a rupture with Jerome, and a bitter controversy. Among the monks of Egypt, one faction were of the same mind as Epiphanius, while another class were enthusiasts for Origen. Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, was moved, largely by personal considerations, to side with the former party, and persecuted the Origenistic monks with such vigor that many fled from the country. A company of them sought an asylum in Constantinople, where John Chrysostom was then bishop. Chrysostom was somewhat disposed to befriend them, and undertook to intercede with Theophilus in their behalf. This provoked the unappeasable wrath of the jealous and intolerant Alexandrian prelate;

[1] See Socrates, vi. 9-18; Sozomen, viii. 11-26; Gieseler, §§ 83, 109; Hefele, §§ 255-257.

and, entering into a league with the enemies of Chrysostom in the church and court of Constantinople, he was able to secure a sentence of banishment against the noble bishop in 403. This was indeed speedily revoked, but was renewed the next year; and the prince of pulpit orators was obliged to spend his last days in exile. This treatment of Chrysostom was strongly disapproved by the Bishop of Rome, though his predecessor had followed the example of Theophilus in condemning Origen. Another assault against the memory of Origen took place in the sixth century. Justinian, ambitiously taking up the *rôle* of the theologian, issued ten anathemas against the teachings of Origen; and a synod, convened at his instance in 543, incorporated these with other specifications, making in all fifteen anathemas.

V.—CONTROVERSIES ON ANTHROPOLOGY.

The Eastern Church, in this period, indulged very little debate on the subject of man's sinfulness and the province of divine grace in his recovery. While Eastern bishops in the synod at Ephesus in 431 pronounced against Pelagianism, their decision was more or less influenced by extraneous motives, and was not based upon any thorough investigation of the Pelagian system, or upon any profound aversion to the same. It was in the Latin Church alone that the great problems of anthropology received a profound and earnest canvassing.

The radical theories of Pelagius, a monk from Britain, were the primary cause of the controversy that arose. The more essential features of his doctrinal system

were a denial of inherited corruption in the moral nature of man, a strong assertion of the freedom of the will, and a decided emphasis upon man's ability to work out his own salvation as opposed to his radical dependence upon divine grace. Such a system naturally provoked the profound opposition of Augustine, whose ardent soul was ever burning with zeal for the honor of divine grace. All the powers of his great mind were brought to the task of refutation. The Pauline conception of sin and grace found in him a more appreciative interpreter than the Church had as yet produced. He criticised, to good effect, the superficial points of Pelagianism, but greatly impaired his service by inculcating an exaggerated idea of divine sovereignty. Augustine was the first of the Christian Fathers to advocate the creed of unconditional predestination.

The positive beginning of the Pelagian controversy may be located about the year 412, when Cœlestius, a prominent disciple of Pelagius, was excommunicated by a Carthaginian synod. In 416 two African synods condemned the Pelagian doctrines, and the Roman bishop Innocent expressed his agreement with their decision. His successor, Zosimus, after a temporary show of favor to the condemned party, gave the full weight of his authority to their proscription. Some adherents still defended the doctrines of Pelagius, among whom the learned and talented Julian of Eclanum especially distinguished himself. No new sect, however, was formed in the interest of Pelagianism; and, as a theoretical system, it was pretty well overthrown in the Latin Church before the death of Augustine. Semi-

Pelagianism, which thrived especially in Gaul, maintained itself for a longer space, and was not emphatically disowned in that region till the sixth century. Still, it was not strict Augustinianism which held the field. In point of theory, the Latin Church showed an inclination to modify the radical tenets of Augustine; while in its spirit and practice it increasingly paid tribute to the idea of salvation by works, and really nurtured a crude species of practical Pelagianism.

CHAPTER IV.

CHURCH CONSTITUTION AND DISCIPLINE.

I.—ELECTION, EDUCATION, AND CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

In the mode of filling ecclesiastical positions, there was exhibited a mixture of the popular and of the hierarchical principle. The tendency, no doubt, was to withdraw the suffrage wholly from the people; but it was only by slow advances that this result was reached. While the presbyters and deacons were appointed by the bishops, the custom remained quite generally in vogue to ask the people if the candidate was acceptable. In the election of a bishop, the bishops of the province were the principal factors; but the will of the people was more or less consulted, and sometimes, especially in the West, asserted itself with determining force. In the elevation, for example, of Ambrose to the bishopric of Milan, the popular choice and enthusiasm bore down every thing else. This rather mixed suffrage, in places where the people were given to violent partisanship, and the clergy were imbued with a worldly and political temper, could easily give rise to unseemly disorders. All abuse, in an age of hierarchical tendencies, was naturally turned to the prejudice of the popular principle. It was after the close of the present

period, however, before the people were legislated out of all participation in the choice of bishops. To be sure, we find the council of Laodicea, in the latter part of the fourth century, prescribing in general terms that the prerogative of electing to the priesthood (ἱερατεῖον) should no longer be conceded to the people.[1] But, as a matter of fact, such a prerogative was not yet fully cancelled, even in the East to which the canon in question more especially applied. As for the West, we meet at the middle of the next century, from so eminent an authority as Leo the Great, the broad statement that "he who is to preside over all should be elected by all."[2] Different plans of episcopal election were finally adopted by the East and the West respectively. The former based its practice upon the fourth canon of the first council of Nicæa, which reads as follows: "The bishop shall be appointed by all [the bishops] in the eparchy [or province]; if this is not possible on account of pressing necessity, or on account of the length of journeys, three at the least shall meet and proceed to the imposition of hands, with the permission of those absent, in writing. The confirmation of what has been done belongs by right, in each eparchy, to the metropolitan." The seventh and eighth ecumenical

[1] Canon 13. See Helele, § 93. The canon is understood by eminent expositors to refer to the episcopal office as well as to that of priests.

[2] Epist. x. 6. "Teneatur subscriptio clericorum, honoratorum testimonium, ordinis consensus et plebis. Qui præfuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur." Compare Epist. xiii. It is interesting to note that this most aggressive champion of the monarchy of the Roman see strongly asserted in another form a democratic principle. Expressing the theory of the common priesthood of believers, he says: "Omnes in Christo regeneratos crucis signum efficit reges, sancti vero Spiritus unctio consecrat sacerdotes" (*Serm.*, iv. 1).

councils (787 and 869) interpeted this canon as meaning that a bishop should be elected only by bishops, and the practice of the Eastern Church was conformed to this interpretation. The Latin Church, on the other hand, regarded the canon as applying only to ordination and confirmation; and while, it too, excluded the people from episcopal elections (about the eleventh century), it excluded likewise the bishops of the province, and confined the suffrage to the clergy of the cathedral Church.[1] As respects confirmation, also, Latin custom ultimately became distinguished from Greek, in that the Pope took the place of the metropolitan in the West, and was credited with the sole determining power to confirm the choice of a bishop. These regulations were in general successful in excluding the mass of the people, but secular princes still had it in their power to exercise much influence over episcopal elections. Even the papal throne itself was sometimes made to represent the overshadowing effect of secular power and patronage.

The isolation of the clergy from ordinary rank and occupation, and the multiplication of theological controversies, naturally turned attention to ministerial education. On the other hand, the growth of ceremonialism, and the attractions which ecclesiastical positions had from a worldly stand-point, tended to qualify the emphasis laid upon the teaching function of the clergy and their own apprehension of the need of thorough culture. As a resultant of these different tendencies, we find special efforts and provisions in the direction of ministerial education, but, at the same time, a wide-

[1] Hefele, § 42.

spread neglect of the same. The latter fact is indicated by the following complaint of Gregory Nazianzen: "Only he can be a physician who has examined into the nature of diseases; he a painter, who has had much experience in mixing colors and drawing forms; but a clergyman may readily be found, not laboriously wrought, but brand-new, sown and full blown in a moment, as the legend says of the giants."[1] Among theological schools, that of Alexandria took the lead at the beginning of the period, but was soon rivalled by that of Antioch. Cæsarea in Palestine was quite an eminent seat of theological culture. A school founded at Edessa in the fourth century, by Ephræm the Syrian, flourished about a hundred years, and educated ministers for Mesopotamia and Persia. A seminary founded at Nisibis in Mesopotamia, in the fifth century, was the chief source of theological culture among the Nestorians. The West could boast of no such noted educational centres, but enterprising bishops in that region in part supplied the lack by personal attention to the training of those within or preparing for the ministry. In both East and West the cloisters were a factor in the education of the clergy; they were, however, relatively less conspicuous in this office in the present than in the subsequent era.

Before the close of the third century there was quite a general preference for clerical celibacy. But still for a time no tribunal, having anything more than provincial jurisdiction, imposed a celibate life upon the three orders of the ministry. The Spanish council of Elvira stood alone, in the first part of the fourth century,

[1] Orat., xliii. 26.

in making this requisition. The council of Ancyra in 314 licensed the deacons, under certain conditions, to live in married relations. The following is the canon which it issued upon the subject: "If deacons, at the time of their appointment, declare that they must marry, and that they cannot lead a celibate life, and if accordingly they marry, they may continue their office, as having the permit of the bishop; but if at the time of their election they have not spoken, and have agreed in taking holy orders to lead a celibate life, and if later they marry, they shall lose their diaconate." The council of Neo-Cæsarea, held about the same time, appears not to have exceeded the above restrictions. While it ordained, "if a priest [or presbyter] marry, he shall be removed from the ranks of the clergy," it said nothing about deacons who might claim the same license. At the council of Nicæa, the question of enforcing celibacy was agitated; but the assembled bishops were persuaded to leave the matter where they found it. "It seemed fit to the bishops," says Socrates, "to introduce a new law into the Church, that those in holy orders (I speak of bishops, presbyters, and deacons) should have no intercourse with the wives whom they had married prior to ordination. And, when it was proposed to deliberate on this matter, Paphnutius, having arisen in the midst of the assembly of bishops, earnestly entreated them not to impose so heavy a yoke upon the ministers of religion."[1] This exhortation of Paphnutius, since he was a distinguished confessor, and had himself lived a strictly celibate life, had great influence; and the proposed law was abandoned. The third canon of Nicæa, which has

[1] Hist. Eccl., i. 11. Compare Sozomen, i. 23.

sometimes been interpreted as a sanction for celibacy, has an entirely different application. It forbids in the houses of the clergy, not wives, but the class of persons called *συνείσακτοι*, *ἀγαπηταὶ*, *sorores;* that is, women undertaking, according to a perilous custom of which there are some earlier traces,[1] to live with men in familiar companionship, and at the same time to keep the vow of virginity. That the canon has no reference to wives proper, is clear, from the fact that the prohibition is extended to every grade of the clergy; whereas legislation, at the very acme of its stringency, never attempted to impose the law of celibacy upon the lower ranks of ecclesiastics.

In the Greek Church, the requirement of celibacy on the part of the entire clergy was never insisted upon. The synod of Gangra (in Paphlagonia), in the latter part of the fourth century, declared it a proper ground for excommunication, if any one should refuse to share in divine service when a married priest was ministering at the altar. Even bishops at this period occasionally lived in married relations after consecration. Such was the case with the father of Gregory Nazianzen, who had children born in his family after assuming the episcopal office, one of them being the distinguished theologian himself. Socrates states that in his time abstinence from marriage was a matter of choice among the clergy of the East, there being no binding law upon the subject.[2] "It was gradually," says one of the most learned, as well as most candid, of Roman-Catholic writers, "that in the Greek Church it became the practice

[1] The council of Ancyra, Canon 19, had already condemned the custom.

[2] Hist. Eccl., v. 22.

to require the bishops and all the higher clergy to abstain from married life. The apostolic canons know nothing of such a requirement. They speak, on the contrary, of married bishops; and church history also gives examples of the same, such as Synesius in the fifth century."[1] In the case of Synesius, the privilege of retaining his wife was made by him a positive condition of accepting the episcopal office. The Greek Church, however, came finally to insist upon celibate bishops. Those who had wives prior to entering upon the office of bishop were put under obligation to part from them. A law to this effect was promulgated by the so-called Trullan council, held at Constantinople in 692. As regards priests and deacons, on the other hand, the ultimate custom of the Greek Church made a single marriage no barrier against consecration, and placed no restriction upon a continuance in married relations consummated prior to consecration. In respect to bishops also, it became usual to avoid an interference with the marriage bond by selecting monks or widower priests to fill vacancies.

In the Latin Church, legislation assumed a more stringent tone. The Roman bishop Siricius, in 385, in answer to inquiries from Spain, issued a decretal letter, in which the position of the council of Elvira was re-affirmed, and married life was disallowed to bishops, presbyters, and deacons.[2] Leo the Great, in the next century, included

[1] Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, § 43.

[2] Epist. i. Compare Epist. x. Henry C. Lea, in his learned work on Sacerdotal Celibacy, calls attention to the lack of historical warrant which the decretals of Siricius exhibit. "It is observable," he says, "that in these decretals no authority is quoted later than the apostolic texts, which, as we have seen, have but little bearing on the subject. No

the sub-deacons under the same requisition. Numerous synods in the fifth century, as that of Carthage in 401, that held under the Roman bishop Innocent I. in 402, that of Orange in 441, prohibited the three orders from living with wives. From the council of Tours, in 461, it appears that those violating the rule of celibacy had been subject to excommunication; but that council modified the penalty, and decreed that priests and Levites continuing in intercourse with their wives should be debarred from promotion, and from officiating in the public service, the communion meanwhile being granted them. In the succeeding centuries, also, the celibate rule received many formal declarations. All this may be taken as evidence that clerical celibacy became well established in this period in the theory of the Latin Church. At the same time, however, the very frequency with which the requirement of it was asserted is a clear hint that there were many exceptions to it in practice. Moreover, the strict safeguards which it was thought necessary to provide for the purity of the clergy indicate that the prohibition of family relations was often the occasion of immorality. In synod after synod it was ordained that no women, other than near relatives, even for the performance of necessary service, should be found in the houses of the clergy.[1]

canons of councils, no epistles of earlier popes, no injunctions of the Fathers are brought forward to strengthen the position assumed, whence the presumption is irresistible, that none such existed, and we may rest satisfied that no evidence has been lost that would prove the pre-existence of the rule."

[1] So the Synods of Arles in 443 or 452, Angers in 453, Agde in 506, Toledo in 527-531, Clermont in 535, Orleans in 549, Elusa in 551, Tours in 567, and Macon in 581.

The causes by which the policy of celibacy was especially urged on were the hierarchical and monastic tendencies of the times. The unmarried state served to distinguish the clergy. It widened the gulf between them and the ordinary classes of men. Monasticism encouraged the idea that a special sanctity pertains to the unwedded life. It was felt that the sacred order of the clergy ought not to fall below the highest standard. Hence, the growing warfare against the domestic instincts of those in holy orders.

II.—DEVELOPMENTS IN THE DIFFERENT RANKS OF THE CLERGY.

1. THE LOWER CLERGY.—The functions of the presbyters remained substantially what they had been since the rise of episcopacy. The deacons, as was largely the case in the previous period, were not occupied solely with the temporalities of the Church, but had a share in the conducting of worship and in the administration of sacraments.[1] In the West, the reading of the Gospels in the public service fell to them rather than to the so-called readers. As to the relations of the two orders, the growth of the hierarchical idea would naturally cause relatively greater emphasis to be placed upon the first. We find instances in which the terms *priests* and *Levites* are employed to express their comparative standing. But, on the other hand, special causes were at work to increase the relative dignity of the deacons. Their limited number favored

[1] From the fifteenth canon of the synod of Arles, held in 314, we learn that deacons had sometimes undertaken the entire administration of the eucharist. The synod forbade this to occur thereafter.

this result. In deference to apostolic precedent, it was thought necessary that there should be only seven in a single church. "Even in the largest towns," says a canon of the council of Neo-Cæsarea, "there must be, according to the rule, no more than seven deacons. This may be proved from the Acts of the Apostles."[1] This limit was indeed transcended before the close of the period, but it was observed for a sufficient interval to add somewhat to the relative importance of the deacon. Still more influential, perhaps, to the same end, was the increase of the temporalities of the Church, and the close association of the deacons, particularly of the archdeacon, with the bishop in their management. At the end of the fourth century the archdeacon appears as the most important officer, after the bishop, in an individual church, in real influence ranked even above the archpriest. He was often made the special agent or ambassador of the bishop, and was quite likely to be his successor upon the episcopal throne.

The office of deaconess received some very positive acknowledgments in these centuries. The eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, which is supposed to have originated in the first quarter of the fourth century, prescribes, in connection with the induction of a candidate to this office, the laying on of hands and a regular formula of ordination. It has this constitution: "O bishop, thou shalt lay thy hands upon her in the presence of the presbytery, and of the deacons and deaconesses, and shalt say: O Eternal God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Creator of man and of woman, who didst replenish with the Spirit Miriam

[1] Canon 15.

and Deborah and Anna and Huldah; who didst not disdain that Thy only begotten Son should be born of a woman; who also in the tabernacle of the testimony, and in the temple, didst ordain women to be keepers of Thy holy gates, — do Thou now also look down upon this Thy servant, who is to be ordained to the office of a deaconess, and grant her Thy Holy Spirit, and cleanse her from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, that she may worthily discharge the work which is committed to her, to Thy glory, and the praise of Thy Christ, with whom glory and adoration be to Thee and the Holy Spirit forever."[1] The fifteenth canon of the council of Chalcedon seems likewise to assume a formal induction into the office. "No one," it says, "should be consecrated deaconess until she is forty years old, and then only after careful probation."[2] A testimony, not less clear than the above, to the fact that ordination and a species of clerical character at one time belonged to deaconesses, comes from the language in which this distinction was abolished by different synods of the Latin Church in the fifth and sixth centuries. The synod of Orange, for example, in 441 published this canon: "Deaconesses are no longer to receive any ordination (*omnimodis non ordinandæ*): such as may still be found should receive [at divine service] the benediction in common with the laity;" that is, not among the clergy as would seem to have been the case in former times. A similar implication is to be found in canons of the councils of Epaon and Orleans, held in 517 and 533 respectively. As

[1] viii. 19, 20.

[2] Canon 15. The same requirement as to age was re-affirmed by Justinian, Novella cxxiii. According to an earlier prescription in the Theodosian code, Lib. XVI., Tit. ii., the required age was sixty years.

might be judged from these decrees, the Western Church, at least in Gaul, had begun before the sixth century to entertain a strong prejudice against the office of deaconess. It was probably not long after this time that it became practically extinct in the Latin Church.

In the Greek Church the deaconess held an honorable rank for a longer period, and the office was not abolished till the twelfth century. Among the more illustrious representatives of the order appears Olympias, whom the correspondence of Chrysostom has commended to our notice. Left a widow in early life, she devoted her wealth to the poor, and herself to the service of the Church, and remained true to her special consecration, notwithstanding the flattering solicitation of the Emperor Theodosius that she should accept the hand of one of his own relatives.

2. The Bishops and Archbishops. — The shaping of the episcopacy toward the aristocratic type went on with increased momentum. The small bishoprics of the country were in many cases absorbed by the larger ones of the cities. Legislation came in to hasten on this process of engrossment. The council of Sardica, in 343, decreed that the episcopal rank ought not to be dishonored by the appointment of bishops to such small places as might suitably be presided over by a simple presbyter. A similar decree was passed, some years later, by the council of Laodicea; and it was ordained that "visitors" (*periodeutai*) — by which probably presbyters commissioned by a city bishop are denoted — should take the place of the country bishops. However, this

order of dignitaries was not fully abolished until a later date. In North Africa the *chorepiscopi*, or country bishops, were still numerous in the fifth century; and representatives of the class appeared at a later date in both East and West.

Among the city bishops, those who presided over the capitals of the provinces enjoyed a certain pre-eminence, not merely in honor, but also in prerogatives. This superiority, awarded in the first instance by custom, was confirmed in the fourth century by the decrees of councils.[1] Prominent points in the pre-eminence of these metropolitans, or archbishops, were the leading part which they took in the ordination of bishops, and their function in calling provincial synods and in presiding over the same.

3. The Patriarchs. — The council of Nicæa acknowledged, in rather indefinite terms, a pre-eminence in the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch among the metropolitans of the Empire. This superiority in honor and jurisdiction came to be denoted by the title of patriarch. It was ultimately recognized as pertaining to five episcopal centres; the council of Constantinople in 381 confirming it to the bishop of that city, and the council of Chalcedon in 451 confirming it to the bishop of Jerusalem. For an interval the metropolitans of Cæsarea in Pontus, Ephesus in pro-consular Asia, and Heraclea in Thrace, held a position approximating to that of patriarchs; but the advancing power

[1] The ninth canon of the council held at Antioch in 341 is especially full and explicit on this subject.

of the bishop of Constantinople ere long imposed limits upon their jurisdiction.

First among the patriarchs, both in virtue of historical associations and the breadth of his jurisdiction, stood the bishop of Rome. His ambition was to extend his supervision over the entire West, and extensive advances were made in that direction. Substantial tributes to his authority were won in Spain, Gaul, and North Africa. In the early part of the period, however, his patriarchate proper probably included only the ten "suburban provinces;" that is, seven provinces in Italy, and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. Even within the limits of Italy, there was territory which was not under the patriarchal authority of the Roman bishop, at least for a part of the period. An independent position was maintained for a time by the bishops of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna. "It must not be overlooked," says Hefele, in his comments on the Nicene canons, "that the bishop of Rome did not exercise over the whole West the full rights of patriarch; for in several provinces simple bishops were ordained without his co-operation." [1]

The patriarch of Constantinople, unlike the bishop of Rome, had worthy rivals in his section of the Empire. Still, the superior advantages which he possessed, as occupying the episcopal throne of an imperial city, enabled him easily to acquire and to maintain the first rank in the East. Moreover, apart from any encroachments on his side, his competitors suffered great depression. The schisms which resulted from the Christological controversies of the fifth century seriously crippled the

[1] Conciliengeschichte, § 42.

rival patriarchates, and the Mohammedan conquests of the seventh century cast them down to a still lower plane of power and influence. Thus Constantinople approached to that solitary eminence in the East which Rome enjoyed in the West.

4. The Pope. — The question whether the Church of this era acknowledged a pope, in the later Roman sense, is by no means to be confounded with the question of the original constitution of the Church. The compact monarchy of France under Louis XIV. is no proof against the dominant influence of the feudal system in that country a few centuries prior to the reign of that great autocrat. In like manner the existence of a full-blown papacy, three or five centuries after the founding of the Church, would be no valid disproof of the limited prerogatives and constitutional equality of all the primitive bishops. Tendencies toward centralization may work in the ecclesiastical as well as in the civil sphere. And what theory allows here, undeniable facts confirm. Centralizing tendencies confined the franchise to the clergy, as opposed to the primitive participation of the laity in the choice of ecclesiastical officers. Centralizing tendencies raised the bishop of Constantinople above all the ancient superiors in his neighborhood, and made him, so to speak, the ecclesiastical monarch of the East. Centralizing tendencies have added even to the theoretical position of the popes of the Middle Ages; and the ecumenical council, which once assumed to anathematize a pope for heresy, and in another instance emphatically declared its own superiority to the Roman pontiff, has been humbled (as

appears from the Vatican council of 1870) to the position of a helpless instrument in the hands of his Holiness. With such an array of facts before us, even should we find a *real pope* between Sylvester and Gregory the Great, we should sin unpardonably against the historic sense in concluding from this that the papacy was any part of the original constitution of the Church. Such a pope might reasonably be regarded as a culminating product of the centralizing tendencies which had long been at work. The Protestant apologist has no real interest to minify the significance of any tributes to the Roman see in this era; the Romish apologist cannot, by any amount of vigor and industry in magnifying those tributes, establish any original supremacy of the Roman see. Flattering utterances of interested parties, at the end of the fourth and during the fifth and sixth centuries, are not even a trustworthy index of what existed at that date; much less are they an index of the type of constitution which preceded the intervening centuries of tendency and struggle towards centralized power.

As already noted, it resulted inevitably, from the conditions of the case, that a movement in the direction of ecclesiastical monarchy should centre in the bishop of Rome, rather than in any other dignitary. Rome was emphatically the centre of the world during the first Christian centuries, and, after its relative decline in actual governing power, it was still able to claim associations with universal empire such as no other city ever enjoyed. Added to this was the fact that it was the sole apostolic seat in the whole West, the reputed scene of the labors and martyrdom of the two greatest

apostles. This latter item, apart from the secular greatness of Rome, would never have secured the ascendency of the Roman bishop, as may be judged from the fortunes of other apostolic seats. Still, backed up, as it was, by the prestige of the imperial city, it was made a factor of no mean influence. If the repeated assertions of the Roman bishops themselves could be trusted, their pre-eminence was due entirely to their connection with the apostles. They were at great pains to assert that their power was an inheritance from Peter, the prince of the apostles; not at all an offshoot from the political importance of Rome. But the reason of this is perfectly evident: they hardly needed ordinary shrewdness to prompt them to such a course. To allow that the greatness of Rome was the source of their pre-eminence, was to allow that their pre-eminence was the product of outward circumstances, and so without any positive authorization by the original constitution of the Church. Moreover, it was easy for them to see that such a sanction left no safeguard to their pre-eminence, since the political importance of Constantinople might become such as to assign them the second rank. The misty region of an apostolic bequest, which, if no one could prove, no one could absolutely disprove, was plainly the safer ground by far upon which to rest.

After these two causes — namely, the imperial greatness of Rome and the apostolic connections of the Roman see — had acquired a certain pre-eminence for the Roman bishop, that very pre-eminence naturally became a cause of its own increase. In proportion to his prestige and influence, his patronage became desirable. Suffering or contending parties had a strong impulse to appeal to

him, apart from any consideration of his constitutional authority, since he was a peculiarly powerful and influential champion.[1] In the disturbed age of polemics, this turned greatly to his advantage. Eastern bishops who had been dispossessed of their sees, or who were seeking the overthrow of a rival, could think of no single prelate who would be likely to assist them so effectually as the Roman. The securing of his support was reckoned as the sure means, or at least as the necessary antecedent, of securing the support of the entire West. While bidding for his patronage, the less considerate were of course inclined to use terms very flattering to Roman prerogatives; terms which, despite their evident rhetoric and exaggeration, could not fail of being turned into Roman capital. The advantage which accrued to the Roman bishops, in this era of controversies, from their position as patrons, was made especially great by the fact that they shared in the conservative temper which very generally characterized the West, rejected the Arian and other novelties, and supported the cause which was ultimately victorious. Their ranks, it is true, were not wholly free from weak and vacillating characters; but there was a sufficient exhibition of steadfastness to bestow a certain prestige upon the Roman see.

[1] Romish apologists are often over-hasty in their inferences from such appeals. Supposing the supreme power to be vested in co-ordinate dignitaries, the tendency would be to appeal to the one who was *practically* most powerful and influential. That an aggrieved bishop, in the absence of other resource, should go to Rome, is no decisive proof that the Church, or that even he himself, acknowledged an *ecclesiastical monarch* there. The only necessary inference is, that he recognized there a *more powerful colleague*, who might be especially serviceable to his cause.

As a result of these several developments, the Roman bishop secured an advance in power and influence, not only within his patriarchate, but to some extent beyond its bounds. Still, he was not constituted a genuine pope within the present period. Taking the whole Church into view, we find that the position conceded to, and enjoyed by, him was that of a leading patriarch, not that of a constitutional head and governor of Christendom. This will appear from an unbiassed canvassing of the verdicts of different parties.

(1) *Individual Fathers and Historians.* It cannot be denied that here and there very emphatic language was used respecting the prerogatives of the Roman bishop. Optatus of Mileve furnishes a prominent instance in the second half of the fourth century. "You cannot affect ignorance," he says to an opponent, "of the fact that the episcopal chair was first established by Peter in the city of Rome, in which Peter sat, the head of all the apostles, in which one chair unity should be maintained by all; that the other apostles should not each set up a chair for himself, but that he should be at once a schismatic and a sinner who should erect any other against that one chair."[1] It is to be observed, however, that Optatus was arguing against the formidable and schismatic Donatists, and had a strong motive to magnify the importance of communion with Rome; since the greater the necessity of communion with Rome, the stronger would be the case for his party and against his opponents. His statement is to be regarded as the one-sided plea of a controversialist. It may be doubted

[1] De Schis. Donat., ii. 2.

whether he would have welcomed any very positive exercise of jurisdiction by the Roman bishop over North Africa, so long as this was not directed to the overthrow of the Donatists, or a like end. Certainly there is clear evidence that the Church in that region, shortly after the publication of his statements, was disposed to repudiate the jurisdiction of the Roman bishop over their affairs.

From Ambrose we have deferential notices of the Roman see. But at the same time he indulges expressions which run against the Roman theory of the primacy. He defines Peter's primacy as one of confession, not of honor; of faith, not of rank, — "primatum confessionis utique, non honoris; primatum fidei, non ordinis."[1] He places Paul upon the same plane as Peter; remarking, that, while they both excel the other apostles by a certain peculiar prerogative (peculiari quadam prærogativa præcellunt), it is uncertain which of the two is to be preferred to the other.[2] Such language indicates, at least, that the later Roman exegesis had not been impressed upon the mind of Ambrose. Equally significant is the record of his administration. Rome had really as little to do with his episcopal rule as had Alexandria or Antioch. "Of any dependence

[1] De Incar. Dom. Sacr., iv.

[2] Serm. ii. in Festo Petri et Pauli (quoted by Gieseler, § 92). The Ambrosian Hilary, in terms more indubitably implying *official* eminence, makes Paul the equal of Peter. "Petrum solum nominat, et sibi comparat; quia primatum ipse acceperat ad fundandam ecclesiam: se quoque pari modo electum, ut primatum habeat in fundandis gentium ecclesiis. . . . Quis eorum auderet Petro primo apostolo, cui claves regni cœlorum dominus dedit, resistere, nisi alius talis, qui fiducia electionis suæ sciens se non imparem constanter improbaret, quod ille sine consilio fecerat." (*Comm. in Epist. ad Galat.*, ii. 7-11.)

of Ambrose," says Schaff, "or of the bishops of Milan in general during the first six centuries, on the jurisdiction of Rome, no trace is to be found."[1]

Viewed by themselves, the statements of Jerome about cancel each other. But, as the temptation to flatter a high dignitary beyond the measure of his position was greater than the incentive to provoke his hostility by assailing the foundation of his pre-eminence, Jerome's representations are, on the whole, rather adverse to the Roman theory. Some of them could scarcely have found utterance where that theory had any firm hold upon conviction. While he speaks of the bishop of Rome as occupying the chair of Peter, he says, when reprobating a custom that obtained there, "If authority be sought for, the world is greater than one city. . . . Neither the power of wealth nor the lowliness of poverty makes a bishop more or less exalted, but all are successors of the apostles."[2] He declares the episcopacy, as a whole (the Roman section of course being included), an outgrowth of ungodly strifes and ambitions, rather than a primitive institute, the churches originally having been governed by the common counsel of presbyters.[3]

Augustine was strongly impressed with the need of the outward unity of the Church, and attached considerable significance to the Roman see as an important factor in conserving that unity. His antagonism to the Donatists and the Pelagians colored, to a conspicuous degree, the ink with which he wrote. Still his writings, as a whole, indicate very little, if any, leaning

[1] Vol. iii., § 61. [2] Epist. cxlvi., Ad Evangelum.
[3] Comm. in Epist. ad Titum., i. 5.

toward the theory of a constitutional supremacy in the Roman bishop. In his more matured exegesis, he was inclined to deny that Christ, in Matt. xvi. 18, named Peter the rock upon which he would build His Church. "On this very account," he writes, "the Lord said, 'On this rock I will build My Church,' because Peter had said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' On this rock, therefore, He said, which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church. *For the Rock was Christ.*"[1] In the same connection, much after the manner of Cyprian, he interprets the position of Peter, in receiving the promise of the keys, as purely representative or symbolical. Therein he typified a function of the Church at large. "He represented the universal Church." As John reclining on the Saviour's bosom typified the whole Church drinking from the fountain of the divine breast, so Peter, in receiving the promise of the keys, typified the binding and loosing prerogatives which were to accrue to the whole Church.[2] In other places, also, Augustine plainly declares that Peter, in the matter of the keys, was made a type of the Church rather than the bearer of any exclusive

[1] Tract. in Joan, cxxiv. Compare Retractat, i. 21. 1; Serm., cclxx. The latter reads, "*Et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam:* non supra Petrum quod tu es; sed supra petram quam confessus es. *Ædificabo* antem *meam ecclesiam*. ædificabo te qui in hoc responsione figuram gestas ecclesiæ."

[2] "It is not the former alone, but the whole Church that bindeth and looseth sins. Nor did the latter alone drink at the fountain of the Lord's breast, to emit again the sublime truths regarding the divinity of Christ; but the Lord has Himself diffused this very gospel through the whole world, that every one of His own may drink thereat according to his own individual capacity." Surely in this comparison of the Petrine with the Johannine primacy, the former is completely robbed of the specifically Romish sense.

authority. "Did Peter," he asks, "receive those keys, and Paul not receive them? Did Peter receive them, and John and James and the rest of the apostles not receive them? Or, are not those keys in the Church, where sins are daily remitted? But, since Peter was symbolically representing the Church, what was given to him singly was given to the Church. So, then, Peter bore the figure of the Church."[1] As Augustine assigns to Peter no exclusive prerogatives, so of course he cannot consistently affirm the transmission of any from him; and, in a just interpretation of his total representation, it cannot be said that he does. If in a few passages he gives special prominence to the Roman see, it was largely because, like some earlier writers in the West, he naturally took Rome as the type of the apostolic churches, there being no other representative of that class in the West. In dealing with schismatics or heretics, it was very convenient to urge their lack of communion with the great centre, the apostolic chair at Rome, as a token that they had broken away from the true fellowship. But, in truth, it is not connection with Rome upon which he most frequently insists. The test of ecclesiastical validity which he especially emphasizes is communion with the Church spread through all lands. In his writings against the Donatists, he charges them again and again with being outside of the Church, not because they were not in communion with Rome, but because they were not in communion with the general Church extended through the whole world. "I bring against you," he says to them, "the charge of schism, which you will deny, but which I will straight-

[1] Serm. cxlix. Compare Epist. liii.

way go on to prove; for, as a matter of fact, you do not communicate with all the nations of the earth, nor with those churches which were founded by the labor of the apostles."[1] Moreover, the authority which he sets up against all personal or provincial decisions is not the mandate of a Roman pontiff, but a general council representative of the whole Christian world.[2]

Some of the Eastern bishops described the eminence of Peter in very emphatic terms, and rendered flattering tributes to his reputed successors at Rome. But interpreted in the light of Eastern usage, and of the special circumstances which called them forth, representations of this kind are found to have little significance. Eastern rhetoric was prodigal of high-sounding terms. Thus Hesychius, a presbyter of Jerusalem, calls James the "commander-in-chief of the new Jerusalem, the ruler of priests, the prince of apostles;"[3] Epiphanius speaks of James as the one "to whom the Lord first intrusted his own throne upon earth;"[4] and Chrysostom names Paul "the apostle of the world."[5] As respects complimentary references to the Roman see, there is no just reason to think that those who uttered them would have accepted an important decision, on the simple authority of that see, which was contrary to their interests or wishes. The instances in which Eastern prelates ignored or contravened the will of the

[1] Cont. Litteras Petil., ii. 16. Compare ii. 32, 51.
[2] De Bap. Cont. Donat., ii. 3; Epist., xliii. 19.
[3] Apud Phot., Bibliotheca, cclxxv.
[4] Hær., lxxii.
[5] Quoted by Barrow, Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy.

Roman bishop are too numerous to allow of a different conclusion.[1]

A strong negative evidence that the Roman theory of the primacy was not current in the East is found in various writings of the time. Take, for example, the correspondence of Basil, amounting to nearly four hundred letters, many of which were written in the heat of great agitations and distractions in the Church. Nowhere do they hint that the sovereignty of the Church was centred in Rome. While their author confesses that the hard-pressed orthodox in the East must place their hope in aid from the West, he refers, as a rule, to the Western bishops generally and not to the Roman pontiff.[2] The inference from the tone and content of the correspondence is decidedly against the supposition of a monarchical constitution of the Church. The same is true of the writings of other prominent men. A special instance worthy of note is contained in a writing of the *pseudo*-Dionysius, composed about the end of the fifth century. In a specification of hierarchical grades, he stops short of monarchy, and ends with co-ordinate dignitaries. Mentioning as the highest rank apostles and their successors, he says, "If any of these should make a slip, let him be corrected by those who are co-ordinate with him."[3] An aristocratic rather than a monarchical constitution was plainly in the thought of Dionysius.

[1] The same Cyril, for instance, who addressed the Roman bishop in such flattering terms at the beginning of his crusade against Nestorius, rudely persecuted the memory of Chrysostom directly in face of the Roman decision in favor of the noble and injured prelate.

[2] See Epist., lxvi., xc., ccxxxix., ccxlii. [3] Epist., viii., § 4.

Perhaps the most substantial tribute to Roman prerogatives which came from individuals in the East is found in the language of Socrates and Sozomen. These historians speak of the Roman bishop as peculiarly intrusted with the guardianship of the faith in the Church at large. They also mention an ecclesiastical canon or law, urged by Julius in his controversy with the Eastern bishops, to the effect that nothing should be done in the Church without the consent of the Roman bishop. The historians here wrote as ardent friends of Athanasius and the Nicene party. Julius was known as one who had vigoriously championed the cause of the deposed bishop, had declared him restored to his see, and had rendered like aid to his orthodox colleagues. Very naturally, therefore, Socrates and Sozomen took a favorable view of his prerogatives, and were averse to charging him with usurpation. The force of their statements, however, is not to be exaggerated. Even under a patriarchal system, apart from any consideration of papal supremacy, the bishop of Rome, as the most honored and influential patriarch, would have had, to some degree, peculiar responsibility in watching over the faith. As respects the canon in question, none such is found in the records of the Church up to the time of Julius. Certainly, no canon of an ecumenical council in that century, or the centuries immediately following, corresponds to the description given, unless an utterly forced interpretation be brought into requisition. Such a canon, however, even had it existed, would not necessarily have implied any thing above the patriarchal system in the constitution of the Church. Under that system, it might well have

been claimed that the Roman bishop should have a voice in all matters which concerned the Church universal. Indeed, the idea more than once found expression, that in affairs of common concern it was needful that all the patriarchs should be consulted.[1] But whatever may be made out of one part of the statements of these historians, there is another part which shows that many in the time of Julius (336–352) utterly disowned any general supremacy in the Roman prelate. In answer to his effort to reverse their action and restore those whom they had deposed, the Eastern bishops, assembled at Antioch, brought forward the charge of unjustifiable usurpation. "It was not his province," they said, "to take cognizance of their decisions in reference to the expulsion of any bishops from their churches, seeing that they had not opposed themselves to him when Novatian was ejected from the Church."[2] "They confessed," says Sozomen, speaking of their epistle to Julius, "that the Church of Rome was entitled to universal honor, because it had been founded by the apostles, and had enjoyed the rank of a metropolitan church from the first preaching of religion, although those who first propagated the knowledge of Christian doctrine in this city came from the East. They added that the second place in point of honor ought not to be assigned to them merely on account of the smallness of their city and their numerical inferiority. They called Julius to account for having admitted Athanasius into communion, and expressed their indignation against him for having insulted their synod and abrogated their decrees, and they reprehended his con-

[1] Compare Gieseler, § 91. [2] Socrates, ii. 15.

duct, because, they said, it was opposed to justice and the canons of the Church."[1]

(2) *Emperors.* Valentinian III., during the quarrel between Leo the Great and Hilary of Gaul, issued the following decree: "Since the merit of the Apostle Peter, and the dignity of the city of Rome, and the authority of a holy synod, have confirmed the primacy of the apostolic chair, no presumption is to enter into any unlawful attempt against that chair. For then, finally, will the peace of the churches be everywhere preserved, when the whole body acknowledges its ruler. The bishops of Gaul, as well as those of other provinces, are not permitted to attempt any thing contrary to ancient custom, without the authority of the venerable Father of the eternal city."[2] Language strongly assertatory of the prerogatives of the Roman bishop! But it is to be observed that the young Valentinian was under the influence of Leo, and that an utterance of imperial favoritism is an entirely different thing from a deliberate verdict of the universal Church. Moreover, Valentinian was emperor only of the West; and his decree, of course, was understood to apply only within territory under his rule. For all that it says, the East might be as independent of Rome and of the West generally, in respect of ecclesiastical control, as it was assumed to be by the Emperor Constantius a century earlier.[3]

[1] iii. 8. [2] Epist. xi. in works of Leo.

[3] "Non enim de orientalibus episcopis in concilio vestro patitur ratio aliquid definire. . . . Si aliquid volueritis contra eosdem prædictis absentibus definire, id quod fuerit usurpatum irrito evanescet effectu." (*Epist ad Synodum Ariminensem, Mansi,* iii. 297.)

Justinian applied very honorary titles to the bishop of Rome; but he employed the same in reference to the bishop of Constantinople, and addressed each of them as "Head of all the Churches." At most, he attached only a primacy of honor to the Roman bishop. Meanwhile, he was bent upon subordinating both of these leading prelates to his own will. The vacillating Roman pontiff Vigilius was treated by him as a refractory subject, and persecuted into assent to his plans. "The damage," says Robertson, "which resulted to the papacy from the conduct of Vigilius, was increased by the circumstances of the appointment of his successor, Pelagius I., when the Emperor Justinian introduced the novelty of confirming the Pope in his office by the imperial sanction, which from that time came to be regarded as necessary.[1]

(3) *Councils.* The council of Sardica (in Illyria) was convened under the auspices of the emperors both of the West and the East, in the year 343. According to the more approved account, one hundred and seventy bishops were present. Seventy-six of these were from the East, leaving ninety-four from the West. The Eastern bishops represented the semi-Arian party; while the Western adhered to the Nicene creed, and were in strong sympathy with Athanasius and others of the deposed bishops of the East. The admission of these last into the council caused the Eastern bishops to withdraw into a separate assembly, where they reaffirmed their sentence against Athanasius and his coexiles, and condemned Julius, Bishop of Rome, because

[1] Growth of the Papal Power.

he had been the first to admit into communion those who were under the ban.

Meanwhile, the Western bishops issued sentence of condemnation against the opposing faction, and proceeded to enact certain canons for the better protection of persecuted members of the orthodox party. The main points in these canons were, that a bishop deposed by his colleagues, and thinking himself unjustly dealt with, should have the right to appeal to the Roman bishop; that the latter, in case he should deem the appeal well-founded, should be empowered to make up a new tribunal from the bishops in the neighborhood of the accused, and, if thought best, to send legates who should have a place in the said tribunal; that the place of a bishop thus appealing was not to be filled until Rome had confirmed his sentence or provided for a new trial.[1]

With respect to these canons, it is to be observed that they do not assume merely to affirm a well-known and established prerogative of the Roman bishop; they assume to *confer* a special prerogative upon him. Their language is at least clear evidence that the right of the Roman pontiff to hear and to decide upon appeals was far from being a universally accepted fact of ecclesiastical constitution. If we should read of a constitutional convention formally stating, as one of its articles, that the veto power should be vested in the President of the United States, we should take it as evidence that such power previously had not been constitutionally his. In like manner, the canons of Sardica are an indication against the previous and clearly recognized existence

[1] Canons 3–5.

of the prerogatives there conferred. Moreover, the council of Sardica was not ecumenical, and represented only one section of the Church.

The ecumenical council of Constantinople, in 381, gave official sanction to the patriarchal standing of the bishop of that city, and declared that he should have the "precedence in honor next to the bishop of Rome, because it [Constantinople] is New Rome." This canon says nothing definite about prerogatives; but certainly the inference from it is, that the bishop of Rome was regarded as simply a patriarch, — the most honored on the list, as presiding over ancient Rome, yet nothing more than a patriarch. His precedence, it is to be noted, is designated as one of honor. There is no hint here of his possessing any extraordinary functions outside of his own patriarchate. He is ranked first because his patriarchate is ranked first.

African synods, convened at Carthage in 407 and 418, included among their canons the requisition that presbyters, deacons, and all of the lower clergy, should be content with African tribunals. Against those who should attempt to appeal to authorities beyond sea (that is, to the Roman bishop), the penalties of deposition and continued excommunication were decreed. A good degree of tenacity, too, was shown in maintaining these decisions. As Zosimus (417–418) assumed to bring the case of a deposed presbyter before his judgment-seat in Rome, the African bishops entered a vigorous protest. Zosimus referred to a canon of the council of Nicæa as bestowing upon him the prerogative in question. This was an entire mistake, quite likely an honest mistake, yet in a manner prophetical

of the office which forged decrees were to perform in building up the papal power. The canon asserted to have come from Nicæa never came from thence, as the Africans took pains to show:[1] it came from Sardica, and, even at that, did not bestow the prerogative claimed.[2] The controversy is significant in a twofold respect. It shows that the Roman bishop felt the need of an authority outside of himself and the primitive constitution of the Church, to support his claim, and that there was a large body of men who were ready to maintain important limitations upon his jurisdiction.

The council of Chalcedon (451) ordained the following as its twenty-eighth canon: "Following throughout the decrees of the holy Fathers, and being acquainted with the recently read canon of the hundred and fifty bishops [the ecumenical council of 381], we have also determined and decreed the same in reference to the prerogatives of the most holy Church of Constantinople, or New Rome. For with propriety did the Fathers confer prerogatives on the throne of ancient Rome, on account of her character as the imperial city; and, moved by the same consideration, the hundred and fifty bishops recognized the same prerogatives also in the most holy throne of New Rome, — with good reason

[1] After a previous canvassing of the subject, the Africans, in 424, declared the spuriousness of the alleged canon, and in very plain terms told the Roman bishop to keep his hand out of their affairs.

[2] The canons of Sardica, relating to appeals to Rome, mention only bishops. A right in bishops to appeal beyond local tribunals does not necessarily imply the same privilege in the lower clergy. The fourteenth canon, which speaks of appeals of priests and deacons, does not mention the Roman bishop, and by no just interpretation could be made to give him any right in such a case as the one in controversy.

judging that the city which is honored with the imperial dignity and the senate, and enjoys the same distinctions as the ancient imperial Rome, should also be equally elevated in ecclesiastical respects, and be the second after her."

The force of this canon, when taken in its entirety, is sufficiently obvious. It prescribes that the patriarch of Constantinople shall have the same prerogatives in his sphere as the patriarch of Rome in his. In point of honor he is to be ranked immediately after the Roman patriarch, since the political importance of Constantinople is only second to that of ancient Rome. The canon gives no hint whatever that any higher character pertains to the Roman bishop than that of the most prominent patriarch; and events subsequent to the council show that that was all that the East was in reality ready to concede. Leo the Great, to whom the founding of the episcopal rank upon the secular rank of the city was entirely obnoxious, strongly denounced the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon. Some of his successors also kept up a vigorous opposition. But the canon stood, nevertheless, and was re-affirmed in the East, and acted upon.

Such legislation has a force that is not to be nullified by the plea that at Chalcedon, reference being made only to the patriarchal standing of the Roman bishop, there is room to assume above and beyond this a silent recognition of his universal office as pope. Silence under certain circumstances becomes equivalent to the most positive testimony. Throughout this entire period of conflicting claims and contentions within the hierarchy, no ecumenical council ever recognized any higher

character in the bishop of Rome than that of a leading patriarch, — a satisfactory evidence to one who does not place dogma above history, that in the consciousness of the universal church he had no higher character. Schaff speaks with full warrant when he says, "It is an undeniable historical fact, that the greatest dogmatic and legislative authorities of the ancient Church bear as decidedly against the specific papal claims of the Roman bishopric, as in favor of its patriarchal rights and an honorary primacy in the patriarchal oligarchy."[1] Acknowledgments beyond this were either individual or local or rhetorical, — the language of self-interest, of controversial ardor, of exaggeration; not the deliberate voice of the Church as a whole.

In other respects, also, the record of the ecumenical councils bears against the theory of the papal monarchy. While such a theory was ignored in their legislation, it was almost equally ignored in their management, as will appear from a consideration of the power convening them, presiding over them, and confirming their decrees.

The authority by which all the ecumenical councils of the period[2] were convened was the imperial decree. No bishop, of whatever rank, was any thing more than

[1] Vol. iii., § 62.

[2] There were five; namely, at Nicæa in 325, Constantinople in 381, Ephesus in 431, Chalcedon in 451, Constantinople in 553. The test of the ecumenical character of a council was not very definitely stated. Respecting some in the above list, there was a measure of uncertainty for a time. What really decided was the general and continued verdict of the Church. The ecumenical character of a council being once acknowledged, its infallibity on questions of dogma, according to a rapidly growing sentiment, was excepted from challenge. On questions of administration, more room for amendment was allowed.

an adviser of the emperor in their convocation. "The first eight ecumenical synods," says Hefele, "were convoked by the emperors, all later ones by the popes; but even in case of the early synods, there was a certain participation of the Pope in convoking them, which, in individual cases, is more or less clearly seen."[1] The closing part of this statement has a very limited application. There is no evidence that the Roman bishop had any agency in assembling the council of Nicæa, except an unsupported assumption put forth several centuries later, an assumption more than offset by the silence of Eusebius and the most ancient documents. It is quite certain, as Hefele concedes, that the bishop of Rome had nothing to do with the calling of the second ecumenical council, in which, indeed, the West had no participation. The third ecumenical council was called by the emperors of the East and the West jointly. It appears probable from the correspondence that the Roman bishop was notified of the proposed assembly, and invited to participation. That he was in any wise acknowledged as a co-partner in the calling of the council, does not appear. The evidence quoted by Hefele in this relation is entirely wide of the point. In the negotiations which preceded the assembling of the fourth ecumenical council, Leo the Great took a prominent part. But he wanted the council in the West; and, when it was finally summoned to meet at Chalcedon, he had ceased to wish that it should be convened. Its call in the end rested entirely upon the will of the Emperor. As respects the summoning of the fifth ecumenical council, any nominal concurrence of the Roman bishop is destitute of all significance,

[1] Conciliengeschichte, Intro.

since he was treated by the government as a tool, and in reality was not honored with so much as an advisory function.

As respects the presidency of these councils, it seems to have been shared in certain cases between the imperial legates and some leading bishop or bishops. At the council of Chalcedon, for example, "the imperial commissaries had the place of honor, in the midst, before the rails of the altar; they are the first named in the minutes; they took the votes, arranged the order of business, closed the sessions."[1] On the other hand, episcopal presidents are mentioned in connection with this and other councils; so that it would seem that a distinction was made, at least in some cases, between the more external management and the spiritual headship. As regards the episcopal presidency, there are clear indications that at the council of Nicæa it fell pre-eminently to Hosius, Bishop of Cordova in Spain. Athanasius speaks of him in a way which clearly implies that he was the president,[2] and his name appears first among the signatures. Hefele acknowledges the pre-eminence of the Spanish prelate at Nicæa, but endeavors to save the honor of the Roman bishop by the supposition that Hosius presided as papal legate in conjunction with the Roman presbyters. But this is entirely gratuitous. To be sure, he is able to quote a writer of the fifth century (Gelasius of Cyzicus), to the effect that Hosius was the representative of the bishop of Rome. There are other data, however, which contradict this statement. There is nothing in the pro-

[1] Hefele.
[2] Apol. de Fuga, v. Compare Theodoret, Hist. Eccl., ii. 15.

ceedings of the council as they have been put upon record, or in the references of contemporary writers, to indicate that Hosius did not act in his own name. Moreover, the personal eminence and fame of the man, and the peculiar esteem in which he was held by the Emperor, adequately explain the bestowment of the honor upon him, especially at a time when the patriarchal dignity had not yet received formal acknowledgment. Athanasius speaks of Hosius as "the great, the confessor."[1] Socrates says that he was intrusted by Constantine with a letter of pacification to Alexandria, and was a bishop "whom the Emperor greatly loved, and held in the highest estimation."[2] Theodoret writes that "Hosius was the most highly distinguished of all those who assembled at the council of Nicæa."[3] Evidently such a man had no need of a Roman commission to make him the most prominent candidate for the presidency. The Roman bishop had nothing to do with presiding over the second and fifth ecumenical councils. At the third, Cyril of Alexandria, who previously had made a successful bid for the place of lieutenant of the Roman bishop, presided, and appended to his signature the observation that he took the place of Celestine of Rome. This does not necessarily imply any thing more than that he *voted* and *subscribed* in the name of the Roman bishop, though interpreters would naturally be found who would include the presidency under the expression. At Chalcedon, the episcopal presidency was in the hands of the Roman presbyters, — the first in-

[1] Epist. ad Episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ, viii.
[2] Hist. Eccl., i. 7.
[3] Hist. Eccl., ii. 15.

stance, says Gieseler, in which Rome was honored with the presidency of an ecumenical council.[1]

In the ratification of the decrees of an ecumenical council, the Emperor was no less pre-eminent than in the calling of such a council. It was first at Chalcedon that any conspicuous attention was paid to the prerogative of the Roman bishop in the matter. The motive for deference in this case is sufficiently obvious, and, indeed, appears upon the face of the correspondence which followed the council. An important canon had been passed, — the famous twenty-eighth, — which was understood to be obnoxious to Leo, and against which his legates had already protested. On this account, there was an urgent occasion to conciliate Leo. Moreover, there was a large body of Monophysites who were disposed to repudiate the council of Chalcedon. If Leo should carry his dislike of the unwelcome canon so far as to appear to reject the work of the council, the Monophysites would urge his position as an excuse for their own want of acquiescence. That this was a weighty consideration, is evident from the fact that the Emperor Marcian made explicit mention of it in a letter to Leo.[2] Thus the request of the council for the confirmation of Leo by no means indicates what was thought to be demanded by the existing constitution of the Church: it indicates simply that the Eastern Fathers had a prudent regard for the practical aspects of the situation. That this is the proper interpretation, is sufficiently obvious from the event. While Leo approved the dogmatic decree of the council, he refused, as previously stated, to sanction the twenty-eighth canon. His refu-

[1] Kirchengeschichte, § 92. [2] Epist. cx., in works of Leo.

sal, however, did not nullify the canon. Reduced to its proper meaning, the request for confirmation which came from Chalcedon to Rome was the language of diplomacy. As respects the fifth ecumenical council, the assent of the Roman bishop to its action is only a testimony to the dominance of the imperial despotism, which, to fulfil its own behests, extorted the assent.

A title peculiar to the Roman bishop did not come into vogue, even in the West, till near the close of the period. "The names *papa* [English "pope"] *pater patrum*, *apostolicus*, *vicarius Christi*, *summus pontifex*, *sedes apostolica* were bestowed also upon other bishops. The indication is that Ennodius, Bishop of Ticinum (510), first applied the title *papa*, in a pre-eminent sense, to the Roman bishop, a designation which from this time became customary in the West."[1]

Among the more eminent of the Roman prelates in this period may be numbered Julius I., Innocent I., Leo I. (commonly called Leo the Great), and Gelasius I. Leo (440–461), in particular, was a man of high intelligence and commanding executive ability, without doubt the ablest man of his generation in the Empire. He was well fitted to advance the authority of the Roman see, and did not scruple to advance it in a rather arbitrary and usurping way. His claims fell little short of those asserted at the culmination of the papal monarchy, at least as respects the ecclesiastical sphere. One may judge of his sense of official elevation from the language employed in his controversy with Hilary of Gaul, who, in the exercise of metropolitan rights conceded by Zosimus, had deposed the bishop of Besançon, and was

[1] Alzog, Kirchengeschichte, § 130.

much displeased at Leo's action in receiving the appeal of the deposed bishop, and restoring him. "Whoever," wrote Leo to the bishops, "presumes to question the primacy of the Apostle Peter can in no wise lessen his honor; but, inflated with the spirit of pride, he plunges himself into hell."[1]

Among the bishops who brought little glory on the Roman see, Liberius and Vigilius may be mentioned. The former, yielding to the persecution of Constantius, signed a semi-Arian creed, the third formula of Sirmium. The evidence for this at least outward defection is entirely conclusive.[2] Vigilius, in addition to his vacillation between opposition and compliance to the dogmatic schemes of Justinian, disgraced the episcopal throne by a villanous character. His elevation was due to the intriguing empress, and was purchased at the price of a secret stipulation that he should favor her Monophysite views, and declare against the creed of Chalcedon. To make room for his installation, false charges were trumped up against the reigning bishop, and he was made a prisoner. Vigilius was believed also to have hastened his death by starvation.[3]

III. — DISCIPLINE.

In accordance with the increase of polemic zeal and the decrease of moral earnestness, the tendency of the age was to sharpen the penalties against heresy, and to

[1] Epist. x. Compare Epist. xii., civ.; Serm. iii.–v.

[2] We have the explicit statement of Athanasius, Hist. Arian. ad Monachos, § 41; Apolog. Cont. Arian., § 89; also of Jerome, Chron.; Catalog. Script. Eccl.; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., iv. 15.

[3] Hefele, § 208.

lessen those against immorality. In some cases the rigor of earlier canons was formally modified. Thus the council of Nicæa set forth the principle that every penitent, whatever his crime, might be admitted to communion in the dying hour, provided he had given previously a suitable exhibition of contrition.[1] There was a general endeavor to proportion the period of penance to the guilt of the penitent. According to the scheme of Basil, based on the preceding legislation of the Church, the period of penance for apostates was to be life-long; for murder, twenty years; for adultery or violation of the vow of virginity, fifteen years; for perjury or robbing of graves, ten years; for communicating with diviners, six years; for theft, when not confessed two years, when confessed one year.[2] In practice, the differing tempers of church officials had much to do with the degree of severity employed. Not a few were inclined to laxity, especially in dealing with culprits of rank. This unworthy concession was strongly denounced by Chrysostom, as appears from his exhortation to those administering the communion. "Though a captain," says he, "or a governor, nay, even one adorned with the imperial crown, approach unworthily, prevent him: you have greater authority than he. Fear God, not man. If you fear man, he will treat you with scorn; if you fear God, you will appear venerable even to men."[3]

As respects confession, two points should be considered; namely, the ground of its importance, as commonly apprehended, and the extent to which it was formally prescribed. As the whole tenor of reference

[1] Canon 13. [2] Epist., ccxvii. [3] Hom. in Matt., lxxxii.

to the subject indicates, the need of confession (to bishop or priest) was an inference from the necessity of penance. According to a notion quite thoroughly developed in the preceding period, sins committed after baptism are not easily forgiven: a special atonement must be made for them; a penance proportionate to the transgression must be fulfilled. As the priests were the proper advisers in respect to penance, there was a standing occasion for those who were conscious of misdeeds to open to them the nature of their offences. This was the motive for the confession of secret sins. The penitent came not to a judge for a sentence of absolution, but to a spiritual director to be set upon the path of a proper atonement. The absolution came at the end of the atonement, or penance, and then was not a judicial sentence, except so far as concerns the penitent's relation to the Church; as respects his relation to God, it was of the nature of a benediction or prayer. Augustine indicates this sense when he says, "The laying on of hands in reconciliation to the Church is not, like baptism, incapable of repetition; for what is it more than a prayer offered over a man?"[1]

In considering the extent to which there was a formal requirement of confession, the following specifications are pertinent: (1) There was no rule requiring all Christians to confess at recurring intervals. "In this period," says Neander, "there was no law requiring confession of sins before the priest at a stated time. Either the bishop excluded from the fellowship of the

[1] De Bap. cont. Donat., iii. 16. Compare the following from Leo the Great, Epist., clxviii.: "Sufficit illa confessio quæ primum Deo offertur, tum etiam sacerdoti, qui pro delictis pœnitentium precator accedit."

Church those whose sins had become sufficiently known, and allowed their restoration only on condition of submission to the discipline ordained by him and accommodated to the case; or they voluntarily confessed their sins to the bishop, thus giving him a token of their penitence, which worked to the softening of the penance imposed."[1] (2) Very largely, participation in the eucharist was left to the conscience of the individual, and he was not required to confess as a condition of participation. On this subject we have information from Socrates and Sozomen. The former says, "When the Novatians separated themselves from the Church because they would not communicate with those who had lapsed during the persecution under Decius, the bishops added to the ecclesiastical canon a presbyter whose duty it should be to receive the confession of penitents who had sinned after baptism. And this mode of discipline is still maintained, among other heretical institutions, by all the rest of the sects; the Homoousians [orthodox Trinitarians] only, together with the Novatians who hold the same doctrinal views, having rejected it. The latter, indeed, would never admit its establishment; and the Homoousians, who are now in the possession of the churches, after retaining the function for a considerable period, abrogated it in the time of Nectarius, in consequence of what occurred in the church of Constantinople [namely, a scandal respecting a woman of noble family]. When, in consequence of this, ecclesiastics were subjected to taunting and reproach, Eudæmon, a presbyter of the church, persuaded Nectarius the bishop to abolish the

[1] Kirchengeschichte, iii. 266.

office of penitentiary presbyter, and *to leave every one to his own conscience with regard to the participation of the sacred mysteries.*"[1] According to Sozomen, the act of Nectarius, in abrogating the office of penitentiary presbyter, was followed generally by the bishops of the East; and he adds language which indicates that, for a time at least, there was a general absence of confession in any form. "From that period," he says, "the performance of penance fell into disuse; and it seems to me that extreme laxity of principle was substituted for the severity and rigor of antiquity. Under the ancient system, I think, offences were of rarer occurrence for people were deterred from their commission by the dread of confessing them, and exposing them to the scrutiny of a severe judge."[2] A state of things in which "the scrutiny of a severe judge" was no longer encountered, implies, of course, an extensive remission of confession, whether private or public. But this liberty could not well continue a great length of time. The prevailing notions respecting the necessity of satisfaction for sins committed after baptism, and the growing emphasis upon priestly rank and mediation, could hardly fail to bring in the complete machinery of the confessional as known in later times.

IV.—SCHISMS CONNECTED WITH QUESTIONS OF DISCIPLINE.

The schism of Damasus and Ursinus, at Rome, merits but a passing glance. It was prepared by the banishment and subsequent restoration of Liberius; this double

[1] Hist. Eccl., v. 19. [2] Hist. Eccl., vii. 16.

change in the fortunes of Liberius involving the installation and then the removal of a rival bishop, and so giving rise to a division of parties. On the death of Liberius, in 366, one party elected Damasus, and the other Ursinus. Damasus won the victory, though at the expense of disgraceful violence on the part of his adherents. In a church that was stormed, as Ammianus reports, one hundred and thirty-seven dead bodies were found.[1] The Meletian schism at Antioch, near the same time, had a somewhat more substantial ground. It grew out of the complications of the struggle with Arianism. Meletius, who was installed by the Arians, afterwards professed the orthodox faith, and secured the support of most of the Catholic bishops of the East; while the West supported his orthodox rival, Paulinus. The division lasted about half a century. Neither of these schisms has special relation to the subject of the section. The great schism on the score of discipline was that of the Donatists in North Africa.

At the close of the Diocletian persecution, a large party in this region cherished a fanatical zeal for martyrdom, scorned all use of prudential means to escape the persecutors' vengeance, and wanted no fellowship with those who had used such means. Opposed to these was a moderate party, who refused all praise to rash and needless sacrifice of life. Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage, and his archdeacon Cæcilian, were conspicuous representatives of this class. Upon the death of the former (about 311), Cæcilian was installed as his successor. His opponents, however, determined to have their own bishop. They declared that the bishop who

[1] Lib. XXVII.

had consecrated Cæcilian was a *traditor*, — that is, one who had delivered up the sacred books to heathen officers, — and maintained that this fact, added to the haste of his election, altogether nullified his title. A certain Majorinus was then installed as their bishop. Upon his death, in 315, the man from whom the party derived its name, the fiery and energetic Donatus, took his place. The schism spread to wide limits, and there was a struggle between the Donatists and the Catholics for the churches. Tribunals appointed by Constantine, as also the Emperor himself, decided against the schismatics.[1] Penal laws were issued, but their effect was only to inflame the zeal of the sectaries; and Constantine finally settled upon the policy of toleration. Persecution, however, was resumed and urged on by Constans and others. Fed with such fuel, Donatist zeal became in many instances a burning fanaticism. A party of ascetics, in particular, the so-called Circumcelliones, in their crazy enthusiasm went so far as to plunder and to murder their opponents; and some of them, as Augustine testifies, cast themselves down from rocks, as if, forsooth, a death secured in this way might merit the crown of martyrdom.[2] Augustine tried the virtue of argument upon the schismatics, but effected little. The Donatists lived on as a powerful faction until the invasion of the Vandals, and a remnant survived even that inundation. Reference to them is found as late as the end of the sixth century.

Like the Montanists, the Donatists insisted that the Church is to be regarded as the assembly of the holy,

[1] Augustine, Epist., xliii., lxxxviii.
[2] Cont. Litteras Petil., i. 24; Epist., xliii. 24.

and that its discipline must be such as to preserve to it this character. They gave little or no place to the policy of sparing the tares lest the wheat be at the same time pulled up, and laid the whole stress upon the idea that unless the tares are eliminated the wheat will be spoiled. They ran into the extreme of affirming that insincere and unworthy members can prejudice the standing of those animated by the most sincere and righteous purposes, that the virtue of the sacraments depends upon the character of the administrator. The Donatist Petilian, as quoted by Augustine, says, "What we look to is the conscience of the giver, to cleanse that of the recipient. He who receives faith from the faithless receives not faith, but guilt. For every thing consists of an origin and root; and, if it have not something for a head, it is nothing; nor does any thing well receive second birth, unless it be born again of good seed."[1] Thus, in emphasizing inconsiderately so spiritual an attribute as holiness, Donatism ran upon the very unspiritual tenet of dependence upon human rather than upon divine connections.

Augustine showed the fallacy and impracticability of Donatism. He convicted its advocates of departing from their own principles in practice, and showed that there was no possibility of administering the Church in strict accordance with their standard, since no human discernment can distinguish with certainty between the worthy and the unworthy. But Augustine, on his part, indulged a one-sided theory. While he allowed that men might be in the general, or Catholic, Church, who were not truly of it, not members of the mystical body

[1] Cont. Litteras Petil., ii. 3–5.

of Christ, he disallowed that any members of Christ's body could be outside of the visible Catholic Church, unless perchance necessity, as opposed to their own will, should keep them out. By the Catholic Church he understood the Church spread through all lands and continuing in communion with the apostolic seats. Augustine's conclusions followed logically from his premises. He assumed that no one can break away from the outward unity of the Church except under the promptings of a spirit contrary to love. To continue in schism involved, in his view, a continued violation of the love which is the very essence of the gospel. "Those," says he, "are wanting in God's love who do not care for the unity of the Church, and consequently we are right in understanding that the Holy Spirit may be said not to be received except in the Catholic Church. Whatever may be received by heretics and schismatics, the charity which covers the multitude of sins is the especial gift of Catholic unity and peace." [1] "The Catholic Church alone is the body of Christ. Outside this body, the Holy Spirit giveth life to no one." [2] Augustine ignored the fact, so emphatically taught by history, that a minority may be in the right, and may be assailed with such intolerance by the majority as to have no way of saving the interests of truth, except by breaking the bond of outward unity. His indiscriminate emphasis upon the external unity of the Church was indeed fitted to serve as a corner-stone in the edifice of spiritual despotism. Schism on slight grounds may be a great crime; but absolutely to disallow

[1] DeBap. cont. Donat., iii. 16.
[2] De Correct. Donat., § 50.

schism is to license a corrupt Church to perpetuate an universal apostasy from the truth. Augustine, with all his spiritual conceptions, elaborated maxims supremely fitted to turn the Church into a kingdom of this world.

CHAPTER V.

WORSHIP AND LIFE.

I.—SACRED TIMES, RITES, AND SERVICES.

THE law of Constantine, issued in 321, relative to the observance of Sunday, contains the following prescription: "On the venerable day of the sun, let the magistrates and the people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain-sowing or for vine-planting."[1] Later emperors re-affirmed this law, and added the prohibition of theatricals and other public spectacles on Sunday.[2] Decrees of similar import were issued by authorities of the Church. The council of Laodicea, for example, discountenanced the practice of resting on the Jewish Sabbath, and prescribed that Christians should honor the Lord's Day, and, when possible, refrain from work on the same.[3]

[1] Cod. Justin., III. xii. 3.

[2] Cod. Theod., VIII. viii. 1; XV. v. 2; XV. v. 5; Cod. Justin. III. xii. 11.

[3] Canon 29. This action indicates that in some communities in the East the Jewish day was observed. Very likely it was in places where a large proportion of Christians were of Jewish antecedents. It is not to be presumed that such neglected the Lord's Day, but rather that they observed two days of the week. Somewhat remarkably, the Apostolic

The central conception of the Lord's Day was the same as heretofore. It was regarded as the weekly festival of the resurrection, — not a fast day, but a day of joy; and, in conformity to this feature, the standing posture in prayer was alone regarded as suitable to its observance, and, indeed, was formally prescribed. The sanctions of the day were also substantially the same as those which were quoted in the previous centuries. Its independent Christian basis, as opposed to any Jewish origin, was universally acknowledged. "In no clearly genuine passage," says a very thorough investigator of the subject, "that I can discover in any writer of these two centuries [the fourth and fifth], or in any public document, ecclesiastical or civil, is the Fourth Commandment referred to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's Day. In no passage is there any hint of the transfer of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day, or of the planting of the Lord's Day on the ruins of the Sabbath. If the Sabbath appears, it appears as a perfectly distinct day." [1] The utmost connection predicated in the first five, perhaps we may say six, centuries between the Jewish and the Christian day appears in the idea, very rarely expressed, that the former was in a sense emblematic of the latter. A conspicuous example of this is seen in the decree of the second council of Macon, in 585, "that no one should allow himself

Constitutions (ii. 59; v. 20; vii. 23; viii. 33) prescribe this double observance. In this they conform to the general view respecting the independence of the Christian day; but in their marked deference to the Jewish day they cannot be taken as an exponent of the mind of the Church at large. The general verdict agreed with Augustine's words: "Dominus sabbatum solvebat" (Serm., cxxxvi).

[1] J. A. Hessey, Sunday, Lect. iii.

on the Lord's Day, under plea of necessity, to put a yoke on the necks of his cattle; but all be occupied with mind and body in the hymns and the praise of God. For this is the day of perpetual rest; this is shadowed out to us by the seventh day in the law and the prophets." This assigning of a typical force to the Jewish Sabbath was quite different from distinctly asserting that the Sabbath law of the Jews was still in force, and was to be regarded as governing the Lord's Day. The emphasis, nevertheless, upon Jewish precedents was a step toward the latter conception.

Among the other days of the week, Wednesday and Friday were very largely distinguished as fast days. At Rome, and in some of the neighboring churches, Saturday was reckoned among fast days, and tended to take the place of Wednesday in this respect. Roman usage naturally became the usage of the Latin Church; still, this result was wrought out but slowly. We learn from Augustine, who decided very emphatically for liberty in this matter, that Western custom was divided in his day.[1] In the East, the practice of fasting on Saturday, even in the lenten season (the Saturday commemorative of Christ's repose in the tomb alone excepted), was steadfastly denounced.

Aside from saints' days, the chief addition in this period to the yearly festivals was Christmas. The first distinct reference to its observance belongs to the pontificate of Liberius (352–366). It appears at this date to have been a well-known festival at Rome. In the East, its introduction was some years later. Chrysostom, in 386, spoke of it as having been known in Antioch for

[1] Epist., xxxvi.

less than ten years, and heartily commended its general observance. In Alexandria, the celebration of Christ's nativity was incorporated with the feast of Epiphany until about 430, when we find indications of the observance of Christmas Day proper.

The reasons which dictated the choice of the 25th of December are involved in obscurity. No general tradition which makes this the time of the nativity can be traced back. In the absence of other data, there is not a little plausibility in the supposition that the location of Christmas was influenced by the fact that heathen Rome was wont to celebrate joyous festivals — such as the Saturnalia, Sigillaria, and Brumalia — in the closing days of the year. To place Christmas at this point, subserved a practical end, since it turned the minds of the people to a new and better occasion of rejoicing. It should be remembered, however, that this is supposition rather than ascertained fact.

Yearly festivals in honor of Mary, the chief apostles, John the Baptist, the martyr Stephen, and of the saints collectively, were quite generally celebrated before the close of the period. Many individual saints received a local commemoration in different quarters. The festivals in honor of the Virgin, which had their beginning within or upon the border of the period, were the following: (1) the Annunciation of Mary, on the 25th of March; (2) the Purification of Mary, or Candlemas, on the 2d of February; (3) the Ascension, or Assumption, of Mary, on the 15th of August. A definite recognition of the first of these is not found till the seventh century; the second was sanctioned by Justinian in 541 or 542; the third, by the Emperor Maurice (582–602).

The basis for this last was a legend which began to be circulated at the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, and which taught, that, after the soul of the Virgin had been carried to heaven by Christ and His angels, her body was carried thither from the presence of the apostles, and was united with the soul.

The tendencies toward sacramentalism, already sufficiently strong in the latter part of the preceding period, show an increased momentum in these centuries. Not content with a rational emphasis upon baptism as a seal of adoption into the family of God, many indulged a decidedly superstitious estimate of its virtue, and depended upon it as an instrument of a kind of magical absolution. The intemperate language of the most eminent theologians encouraged the exaggerated notions. Thus Chrysostom says, "As the element of fire, when it meets with ore from the mine, straightway of earth makes it gold, even so and much more baptism makes those who are washed to be gold instead of clay; the Spirit at that time falling like fire into our souls, burning up the image of the earthy, and producing the image of the heavenly, fresh coined, bright and glittering, as from the furnace mould. . . . To have been born the mystical birth, and to have been cleansed from all our former sins, comes from baptism."[1] Frequently, that this wholesale remission might be enjoyed late in life, there were long delays in receiving baptism. An earthquake or pestilence was very apt to hurry up the delinquents. Easter was the favorite season for baptism; though, in the East, Epiphany was also chosen. Infant baptism was universally recognized in theory; but in practice, espe-

[1] Hom. in Joan., x.

cially in the East, there were many instances in which parents delayed to have it administered. The current mode of baptizing was the threefold immersion. The import attached to this form of the ordinance is expressed by Chrysostom as follows: "When we immerse our heads in the water, the old man is buried as in a tomb below, and wholly sunk forever; then, as we raise them again, the new man rises in its stead. And this is done thrice, that you may learn that the power of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost fulfilleth all this."[1] Immersion, however, was not strictly identified with the essence of baptism, as is evident from the indulgence granted to the sick.[2] Besides exorcism and anointing, various practices were connected with baptism in different quarters; such as breathing on the candidate, giving him a taste of consecrated salt, clothing him, after his reception of the rite, in a white garment, and presenting him with a mixture of milk and honey.

Strong language was used in describing the mystery of the eucharist. Nothing less could have been expected of an uncritical, mystery-loving, ritualistic age, considering the terms employed at the institution of the ordinance. The consecrated elements were evidently regarded as something more than mere symbols of the body and blood of Christ. This, however, does not import that transubstantiation was an accepted dogma. On the contrary, there are very weighty evidences in the writings of Athanasius, Augustine, Theodoret, the Roman bishop Gelasius, and others, that the consecrated elements were regarded as the body and

[1] Hom. in Joan., xxv.

[2] Council of Neo-Cæsarea, Canon 12; Council of Laodicea, Canon 47.

blood of Christ only in virtue of their symbolical import, and their being *accompanied* by Christ's *mystical* presence. The sacrificial character attributed to the eucharist does not contradict this conclusion; for the fact of a sacrifice might very well have been emphasized long before it was thought that the elements were transformed into the actual body and blood of Christ. The bread and wine constituted the mystical body and blood of the Redeemer by the presence (as was believed) of a divine component, and, made objects of religious awe by this fact, furnished sufficient basis for the idea of sacrifice that was developed. If any writers held a more ultra view, and conceived of an actual transubstantiation of the eucharistic elements, it was only a matter of individual opinion, no part of an accepted creed. The extravagance of rhetorical usage makes interpretation, in several cases, very difficult. Baur concludes that even in these cases an actual transubstantiation was not designed to be taught.[1] If this conclusion be accepted, extravagance met a signal retribution; the rhetoric of one age became the dogma of the next. As respects the sacrificial aspect, a very emphatic view was undoubtedly current. The theory was already at hand, that the eucharistic sacrifice is able to benefit the dead. "We pray," says Cyril of Jerusalem, "for holy fathers and bishops, and all who have departed from our midst, believing that it is of

[1] Kirchengeschichte, ii. 281. Wenn auch den Worten nach in so vielen Stellen der Kirchenlehrer schon jetzt von eigentlichen Verwandlung die Rede zu sein scheint, so ist diess doch keineswegs im Sinne einer dogmatischen Behauptung zu nehmen; die Ausdrücke, die darauf hinzudeuten scheinen, lösen sich bei genauerer Betrachtung immer wieder in eine blos bildliche Anschauung auf.

the greatest assistance to those souls for whom the prayer is offered, while the holy and awe-inspiring sacrifice lies before us."[1] Communion in both kinds was the established custom of this age. No one thought, as yet, of depriving the laity of the cup.

The multiplication of costly edifices gave suitable accommodation to the tendencies toward a showy and imposing ritual. A special sanctity was attached to the house of public worship; but eminent teachers took pains to oppose a superstitious veneration of the mere edifice, and emphasized the truth that to the devout Christian every place is holy ground. The same factors entered into the regular Sunday service as in the previous period; namely, the reading of selections from the Scriptures, prayers, the sermon, and the eucharist. The Scripture readings were left quite generally to the choice of the officiating clergy, though a beginning was made

[1] Orat. Catech., xxiii. 9. Augustine speaks on the same subject still more explicitly. His language indicates that already at the beginning of the fifth century the foundation was well laid for the doctrine of purgatory. "It cannot be denied," he says, "that the souls of the dead are benefited by the piety of their living friends, who offer the sacrifice of the Mediator, or give alms in the church on their behalf. But these services are of advantage only to those who during their lives have earned such merit that services of this kind can help them. For there is a manner of life which is neither so good as not to require these services after death, nor so bad that such services are of no avail after death; there is, on the other hand, a kind of life so good as not to require them; and again, one so bad that when life is over they render no help. . . . When, then, sacrifices either of the altar or of alms are offered on behalf of all the baptized, they are thank-offerings for the very good, they are propitiatory offerings for the not very bad; and in case of the very bad, even though they do not assist the dead, they are a species of consolation to the living. And where they are profitable, their benefit consists either in obtaining a full remission of sins, or at least in making the condemnation more tolerable." (*Enchiridion*, chap. cx.)

toward the prescription of a regular series of lessons. The forms of prayer varied, to a considerable extent, in different churches. Socrates indulges the statement that hardly two churches agreed in their ritual respecting prayers.[1] Very diverse estimates were passed upon the relative importance of the sermon. In the West, there was a tendency to give it a subordinate place, especially as compared with the eucharistic service. In the East, the more cultured class, in the fourth and fifth centuries, were inclined to regard the sermon as the principal factor in the service; and their love of fine rhetoric not unfrequently found vent in enthusiastic applause. "The sermons were sometimes, though rarely, read or delivered from memory from beginning to end, sometimes given in accordance with a plan previously prepared, sometimes uttered entirely extempore."[2] Toward the close of the period, the requirement that catechumens and other non-communicants should leave the sanctuary before the celebration of the eucharist was relaxed. The absence of a pagan populace made it appear less necessary to employ precaution against a profanation of the mystery.

II. — VENERATION OF SAINTS, RELICS, AND IMAGES.

Reverence for the martyrs may be regarded as the starting-point of saint-worship. To the incentive from this source were added the longing after fellowship with the departed, and the bent to polytheism which still clung to the masses that poured into the Church after the conversion of Constantine. Already, at the

[1] Hist. Eccl., v. 22.

[2] Neander, Kirchengeschichte, iii. 443.

close of the persecutions, honor to the memory of the martyrs was carried to an excess by a fraction of the Church. Very soon after that date, reverence was exaggerated into a species of idolatry; and prayers were addressed to the martyrs on the ground of their exaltation and their effective intercessions with God. Churches and chapels were built over their graves. Rites bearing the semblance of sacrifices to the glorified confessors were sometimes celebrated upon these hallowed spots. Augustine acknowledges the existence of such a custom, but asserts that it was observed only to a limited extent, and seeks to relieve it from any idolatrous intent. "Whatever honors," says he, "the religious may pay in the places of the martyrs, they are but honors rendered to their memories, not sacred rites or sacrifices offered to dead men as to gods. And even such as bring thither food — which, indeed, is not done by the better Christians, and in most places of the world is not done at all — do so that it may be sanctified to them through the merits of the martyrs, — first presenting food and offering prayer, and thereafter taking it away to be eaten, or to be in part bestowed upon the needy."[1] In an epistle to Maximus he writes: "Let me assure you that by the Christian Catholics no deceased person is worshipped."[2] And in one of his sermons he declares: "We do not regard the martyrs as gods, or worship them as gods; we do not prepare for them temples or altars or sacrifices."[3] Augustine in this represents the most sober and conservative temper of his age. A statement more in the line of the popular estimate of the martyrs is found with Theodoret, who

[1] De Civ. Dei, viii. 27. [2] Epist., xvii. [3] Serm., cclxxiii.

wrote some years later in the fifth century. "While time," says he, "is wont to waste all other things, it has nevertheless preserved their glory incorrupt. The noble souls of the victors now traverse heaven and are present with angelic choirs. No single tomb conceals the body of each; but cities and villages, sharing their remains, name them saviors and physicians of souls and bodies, and honor them as protectors and guardians of cities, and obtain gifts through their intercession with the Lord of the universe. . . . Shrines of the triumphant martyrs rise to view, shining and conspicuous, excelling in size, distinguished by every kind of ornament, and shedding abroad the gleams of their beauty. We visit these not once or twice or five times a year, but celebrate with frequent assemblies, — often even upon each day sing hymns of praise to their God; and those who are in health ask that this may be preserved; those who are suffering from any disease, that they may be delivered from their sickness. Men destitute of children supplicate for these, and barren women pray that they may become mothers. Those who have obtained a gift beseech that it may be kept secure. Those engaging in travel request of these that they will be companions of the way and guides of the journey; those who return safe render thanks, not addressing them as gods, but entreating them as divine men, and requesting them to be intercessors in their behalf. That those who trustingly seek obtain their wishes, their votive offerings openly testify, indicating the cure. For some suspend images of eyes, others of feet, others of hands made of silver and gold."[1] Great diversities, no doubt,

[1] Græc. Affect. Curat., Sermo viii.

existed as respects the degree in which individuals were inclined to appeal to such intercessors; but the propriety of such appeal had become a common tenet at the end of the fourth century.

The honors bestowed upon the martyrs naturally came to be extended to others who were regarded as eminent examples of Christian devotion. From generation to generation, new names were added to the list of saintly intercessors. Among those claiming the foremost homage appeared the Virgin Mary. Prior to the closing part of the fourth century, she received only the common veneration accorded to the saints. But after this time, owing, in some degree, to the prominence given to her name in the orthodox shibboleth of the Christological controversies, the tide set strongly in the direction of mariolatry. Before the death of Augustine, two dogmatic principles in favor of the special elevation of Mary had been broached: namely, her perpetual virginity,[1] and her freedom from actual (not original) sin, though the latter had not been as yet extensively advocated. The practice of dedicating churches and altars to her became popular. "Justinian I., in a law, implored her intercession with God for the restoration of the Roman Empire; and on the dedication of the costly altar of the Church of St. Sophia, he expected all blessings for Church and Empire from her powerful prayers. His general Narses, like the knights of the Middle Ages,

[1] To challenge this doctrine, at the end of the fourth century, was to incur bitter hostility, as appears from the fate of Helvidius, Bonosus, and some others.

was unwilling to go into battle till he had secured her protection."[1]

Parallel with the honors paid to martyrs and other saints, and like them gradually passing from a natural and normal respect to a kind of superstitious worship, were the honors rendered to their relics. The passage cited from Theodoret shows how sacredly such memorials were treasured by different places, and how great benefits were supposed to depend upon their presence. A striking index of the gross form which veneration of relics sometimes assumed is supplied by Evagrius, who lived in the latter part of the sixth century. Speaking of the martyr's remains, which were regarded as the glory of the church of St. Euphemia, he says, "There is an aperture in the left side of the coffin, secured with small doors, through which they introduce a sponge attached to an iron rod, so as to reach the sacred relics; and, after turning it around, they draw it out, covered with stains and clots of blood. On witnessing this, all the people bend in worship, giving glory to God."[2] It would appear, however, that relic-worship did not gain the ascendency without being vigorously challenged by at least a few. Vigilantius, a presbyter of Barcelona in Spain, and a contemporary of Jerome, heaped open scorn upon the idolatrous practices of his time, and named those engaged in them "worshippers of ashes, and idolaters."

[1] Schaff, Church History, iii. § 82. We notice also that in the oath prescribed by Justinian to those undertaking public offices, Mary is placed next to the persons of the Trinity; then follow the four Gospels and the archangels Michael and Gabriel. (*Novella* ix.)

[2] Hist. Eccl., ii. 3.

A conspicuous place among relics was occupied by fragments of the cross. The assumed discovery of this took place as early as the time of Constantine. His mother, Helena, had the honor of bringing to light the sacred memorial. Being in search of the Holy Sepulchre, she caused the idolatrous temple, which cumbered the site, to be removed. "The tomb," writes Theodoret, "which had long been concealed, was discovered; and three crosses, the memorials of the Lord, were perceived near it. All were of opinion that one of these crosses was that of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the other two were those of the thieves who were crucified with Him. Yet they could not discern upon which one the body of our Lord had been nailed, and upon which His blood had fallen. But the wise and holy Macarius, the bishop of the city, succeeded in resolving this question. After engaging in prayer, he induced a lady of rank, who had long been suffering from disease, to touch each of the crosses; and the efficacious power residing in that of the Saviour manifested its identity. In fact, it had scarcely been brought near the lady, when the inveterate disease left her and she was healed."[1] Soon the world was filled with splinters of the true cross; and there was genuine occasion for the theory, broached by some, that the wood of the original was miraculously replenished. Relics of other kinds also became suspiciously plentiful. Even in the verdict of those believing in relics, the trade in this species of merchandise was overdone, and attempts were made in the direction of its limitation.

[1] Hist. Eccl., i. 18. Compare Rufinus, Hist. Eccl., i. 7, 8; Socrates, i. 17; Sulpicius Severus, Hist. Sacra, ii. 34.

Relic-worship naturally added greatly to the impulse to visit sacred places. Great multitudes were turned towards Palestine. Chrysostom speaks of the whole world as streaming to the site of Christ's birth, suffering, and burial. Rome was also a favorite pilgrim resort, both on account of the worldly celebrity of the city and the sanctity given it by the graves of the great apostles. The relics of St. Stephen attracted many to Hippo in North Africa. Multitudes in quest of miracles flocked to the tomb of Martin of Tours in Gaul. Meanwhile there were emphatic cautions against an overestimate of the virtue of pilgrimages. Jerome affirmed that the place of the crucifixion profits those only who bear their cross, and that heaven is as accessible in Britain as in Jerusalem.[1] Gregory of Nyssa pointed to the immoralities flourishing in pilgrim resorts as a proof of the little worth of that which is addressed merely to the senses. "Change of place," says he, "brings God no nearer. Where thou art, God will come to thee, if the dwelling of thy soul is so prepared that God can dwell and rule in thee."[2]

The development of tendencies to image-worship was not so radical and universal, in this period, as was the growth of saint and relic worship. At the close of the fourth century it had become quite common to adorn churches with pictures, especially with scenes from the history of martyrs. This, however, was obnoxious to some, as appears from the decided reprobation of such a practice by Epiphanius. Near the same time a fraction of the Church began to pay a superstitious homage to the pictured or sculptured representations of vener-

[1] Epist. lviii., Ad Paulinam. [2] Opera, Tom. iii., Epist. ii.

ated persons. "I know," says Augustine, "that there are many worshippers of tombs and pictures."[1] At the same time, he intimates that such persons were to be found only among the ignorant, superstitious, and nominal Christians. Augustine's judgment on this subject was largely prevalent in the Latin Church for a considerable interval after his time. "In the Church of the West," says Neander, "this moderate policy, holding to the mean between unconditional repudiation of images and their worship, maintained itself into the next period, as we see from the example of the Roman bishop, Gregory the Great."[2] In the East, on the other hand, even the better class imbibed the superstition of the more ignorant; and in the course of the sixth century it became the dominant custom to honor those who were objects of special veneration by doing obeisance before their images. The theory which lay back of the practice may be seen in the following statement from the apology of Leontius, a bishop of Cyprus, in this century: "The images are not our gods, but they are images of Christ and His saints, for the commemoration and honor of whom, and for the adornment of the churches, they are employed and are venerated. For he who honors the martyr honors God, and he who worships His mother pays homage to Him, and he who honors an apostle honors Him who sent him." Much after the manner of the Emperor Julian's defence of idol-worship, Leontius commends the veneration of images, by reference to the tokens of endearment which affectionate children might bestow on the memorials of an absent parent. He

[1] De Moribus Eccl. Cath., § 75.
[2] Kirchengeschichte, iii. 412.

claims, also, gracious effects from images in healing the possessed and in converting the ungodly.[1]

III.—MIRACLES OF SAINTS AND RELICS.

A notable characteristic of the whole period was the ready assent accorded to reputed miracles of relics and of living saints. Distinguished monks, in particular, were credited with the wonder-working faculty. It was not merely the unthinking populace which reposed faith in the multitude of prodigies that were reported: eminent Fathers of the Church added the weight of their testimony in favor of the supernatural power exercised through relics and pious ascetics. This may be thought to establish a certain presumption on the side of the reality of the so-called miracles. But off-setting considerations of no little weight may be enumerated: (1) In so far as heathen tendencies had come into the Church with the masses formerly devoted to heathenism, the heathen predilection for the magical and the marvellous, as contrasted with the moral, was rife. There was a certain inordinate greed for the miraculous, and demand tends to create supply. (2) Catholics had a motive to make the most of reputed miracles, in order to outshine schismatics and heretics, who also laid claim to miracles.[2] That the more thoughtless would be influenced by such a motive, may properly be taken for granted. Especially would such be incited by personal affection and interest to exalt the deeds of an associate

[1] Mansi, xiii. 43-54.

[2] The language of Augustine, Tract. in Joan., xiii. 17, indicates that the Donatists appealed to miracles with an apologetic design.

or leader whose glory was in a manner their own. (3) There is clear evidence that pious frauds were practised with relics for the sake of gain. The same temper which devised fraudulent relics could easily be incited to devise fraudulent miracles with relics. The age, even in its theories, was none too well braced against such an artifice. The casuistry of several of the Fathers, which openly justified a certain employment of falsehood, though far from being carried out by themselves into a habit of mendacity, was not helpful to the scruples of those having less of moral ballast.[1] (4) To challenge reputed miracles, was to stem the current of the age. The doubter was quite certain to bring opprobrium upon himself. A ready assent to every indication of the supernatural within the hallowed precincts of the Catholic Church was reckoned a great virtue. Even men of the strongest mind were powerfully influenced by the spirit of the times, and in the main were more ready to believe than to make a searching examination of the grounds of belief. Criticism being thus held in abeyance, there was a great chance of deceiving even the intelligent and the sincere. (5) Many of the miracles reported bear evident traces of being products of a crude and superstitious fancy, instead of resulting from divine discretion and power. Taken in a mass, the miracles of this age lack the profound occasion and

[1] Jerome, Comm. in Epist. ad Gal., chap. ii.; Epist., cxii.; Chrysostom, De Sacerdotio, i.; Cassianus, Coll., xvii. 17. Augustine, on the other hand, entered a strong protest against the *mendacium officiosum*, and worthily accented the claims of truthfulness (Epist., xxviii., xl., lxxxii.). "To me," he says, "it seems certain that every lie is a sin, though it makes a great difference with what intention and on what subject one lies" (*Enchirid.*, xviii.).

the lofty moral accompaniments which attest the genuineness of the gospel miracles and harmonize them with the noblest conceptions of the divine government. (6) There is much power in an ardent faith, viewed simply as an exercise of mind, and apart from any objective agency. Certain mental disorders, or even certain bodily disorders, coming specially within the range of the mind's reaction, may have been actually cured by circumstances that were peculiarly stimulating to the faith of the afflicted.

The historian, in the exercise of a sound discretion, is compelled to adopt a critical attitude upon this subject. To accept the mass of reputed miracles, would be credulity rather than faith, a surrender of reason rather than its consecration, a disparagement of the Christian system rather than a tribute to its spirituality. At the same time, to affirm absolutely that there were no miracles in these centuries, is to indulge in sheer dogmatism.

IV.—GENERAL TONE OF CHRISTIAN LIFE.

The preceding pages have given more than one unfavorable suggestion as to the moral and religious state of the people; and additions might be made to the adverse record, such as a notice of the excesses occurring at the feasts of martyrs, as deplored by Augustine, or a reference to the senseless fervors of the populace over the races of the circus, which divided Constantinople and other cities into warring factions. The evidences of a sad declension from the moral standard of the martyr age are plain and decisive.

Nevertheless, there are features of relief in the out-

look. An exaggerated impression may easily be formed by dwelling upon the crudities and corruptions of the times. It was a mixed age. If the popular superstitions infected in a measure even those who stood highest, these in their turn gave back much, both in the way of teaching and example, that was lofty and ennobling. What a healthy tone, for example, in Chrysostom's repeated exhortations to the devout study of the Scriptures! Commenting on the language of Paul (Col. iii. 16, 17), he says, "Hearken ye, as many as are engaged in the affairs of the world, and have the charge of wife and children: how to you, too, he commits especially the reading of the Scriptures; and that not to be done lightly, nor in any sort of way, but with much earnestness."[1] "We ought not," he says in another place, "as soon as we retire from the communion, to plunge into business unsuited to the communion; but, as soon as ever we get home, to take our Bible into our hands, and call our wife and children to join us in putting together what we have heard, and then, not before, engage in the business of life."[2] Again, how aptly he warns against the mercenary and ostentatious style of piety! "The secure storehouse of good works," he urges, "is to forget our good works. And as with regard to raiment and gold, when we expose them in a market-place, we attract many ill-meaning persons; but if we put them by at home, and hide them, we shall deposit them all in security: even so with respect to our good deeds; if we are continually keeping them in memory, we provoke the Lord, we arm the enemy, we invite him to steal them away; but, if no one

[1] Hom. in Colos., ix. [2] Hom. in Matt., v.

know of them besides Him who alone ought to know, they will lie in safety."[1] Augustine, too, abounds in passages savoring of the highest spirituality. Take, as a single example, his description of the Christian sacrifice: "Our heart when it rises to Him is His altar; the priest who intercedes for us is His Only-begotten; we sacrifice to Him bleeding victims when we contend for His truth even unto blood; to Him we offer the sweetest incense when we come before Him burning with holy and pious love; to Him we devote and surrender ourselves and His gifts in us. For He is the fountain of our happiness, He the end of all our desires. Being attached to Him, or rather let me say re-attached, — for we had detached ourselves and lost hold of Him, — being, I say, re-attached to Him, we tend towards Him by love, that we may rest in Him, and find our blessedness by attaining that end. For our good, about which philosophers have so keenly contended, is nothing else than to be united to God."[2] Despite the adverse tendencies of the age, truths such as these, faithfully inculcated by many earnest teachers, must have borne much good fruit.

V. — MONASTICISM.

The most extraordinary development in the sphere of Christian life in this era was undoubtedly monasticism. History presents few examples of a more striking conjunction of extremes than we have here. Just as the Church came, on the one hand, into close alliance with the world, and was replenished with elegance and lux-

[1] Ibid., iii. [2] De Civ. Dei, x. 3.

ury, it hastened, on the other, into the most radical repudiation of the world and of the ordinary refinements and comforts of life. Over against the sumptuous prelate, clad in costly vestments, and officiating in a magnificent temple, we have the picture of the half-starved ascetic, clothed in sheepskin, and choosing such habitations as nature has appointed to the wild beasts. The origin of such a startling counterpart to a rich and prosperous Church may well claim special attention.

1. Causes. — In inquiring after the causes of Christian monasticism, we are met at once with the fact that monastic life had been widely cultivated before the Christian era. Brahmanism had fostered it in its most radical forms; Buddhism had given it extensive patronage; Judaism had found a place for it in the sects of the Essenes and the Therapeutæ; and even Hellenism had given, to some extent, an example of it in the school of Pythagoras. A glance at these developments cannot fail to suggest the thought that there was a common cause back of them, a cause contributing also to the rise of Christian monasticism. This cause may be defined as the painful consciousness of the alienation of the world, and of the individual in his natural state, from God. Men feeling this, as has been the case in every age not wholly wanting in vitality of religious sentiment, have experienced a powerful incentive to seek for some remedy.. In the absence of a far-seeing spiritual philosophy, it was natural that they should resort to the remedy most immediately suggested by the conditions; that is, to an extraordinary renunciation of the world, and an extraordinary crucifixion of the natural

life. What was thus originated by a species of religious earnestness, custom and various accessory influences might combine to perpetuate.

There were, however, in addition to this general incentive, the following specific causes of the rise and spread of Christian monasticism in these centuries: (1) A bias carried over from the preceding period. Centuries of persecution by heathen authorities had caused many to associate the secular world with heathenism and with the evil powers which were supposed to be the patrons of heathenism. After the espousal of Christianity by the State, remnants of this feeling were still at hand; and since the partition-wall between the general Church and the world had been broken down, the inherited feeling of opposition to the latter sought satisfaction in a select and isolated station within the Church. (2) The contagion of heathen ideas. In combating Gnosticism and Manichæism, the Church had formally disowned the idea that matter is essentially evil, and its corollaries respecting the human body. What was combated, however, was so much in the atmosphere of the times, and maintained such prolonged contact with the Church, that it obtained a certain foothold within its borders, despite a formal and theoretical opposition. The body came practically to be regarded by many as a synonyme for the evil part of human nature, and the voluntary persecution of it was looked upon as the highest virtue. (3) A mistaken interpretation of biblical examples. The distinction between the Old and the New Testament order of things was not duly observed. Men of the wilderness, therefore, like Elijah and John the Baptist, were looked

upon as models especially worthy of emulation. (4) An over-estimate of martyrdom and a thirst for some equivalent. Not only had martyrdom come to be regarded as a direct path to the glory of heaven: to a large degree it had become in fact a direct path to a cherished and glorified memory among men. Those filled with admiration for the martyrs, and emulous of their heroism, saw this path closed against them by the cessation of persecution. It only remained for them to exhibit their fortitude by the self-imposed trials of the ascetic life. (5) A reaction against the growing worldliness within the Church. (6) Various personal needs and desires. Some, no doubt, entered the monastic life because they sincerely thirsted after fellowship with God, and expected to find in retirement from the world an effectual aid toward spiritual perfection. Some were moved by a desire to atone for serious guilt. Some were instigated by the mere force of example. With some there was no higher motive than a covetousness after the distinction and homage which were seen to accrue to various representatives of monastic rigors. (7) Habituation to the wilderness life into which individuals had been driven by the later persecutions.

2. Historical Outlines. — Several stages, more or less clearly marked, may be distinguished in the history of monasticism: (1) The comparatively unorganized asceticism of the first three centuries, a life of superior abstinence which individuals assumed without being widely separated from the mass of Christians. (2) Anchoretism, or the hermit life, characterized by solitude and great austerity. (3) Cenobite, or cloister

life, nearly simultaneous in its rise with the preceding, but destined to a much more permanent and extensive appropriation within the bounds of Christendom. (4) The rise in the Latin Church of the great orders of the Middle Ages, — orders in which all the cloisters were subject to the same central authority. The Order of Clugny, and still more the Franciscans and the Dominicans, represent this stage.

The first of the hermits, whose name has come down to us, was the semi-mythical Paul of Thebes. Having entered the wilderness as a young man during the Decian persecution, he is said to have dwelt there, in a cave, for ninety years. Among the fabulous stories connected with his memory are the accounts of his having been fed daily by ravens, and of his death having been lamented by two lions, who also did him the honor to scratch him a grave in the sand. The founding of the hermit life, however, is not to be attributed to him so much as to the one who discovered his retreat, the renowned Anthony. If he was not the first of the hermits in point of time, he was still, as Jerome remarks, the first to excite a special zeal for the hermit life.

Anthony was born about 251, at Coma, on the border of the Thebaid. He belonged to a Christian Coptic family. His education was meagre, and seems to have stopped short of the Greek language and literature, at least not to have proceeded beyond the elements. The death of his parents in his eighteenth year devolved upon him the care of the inherited estate. But worldly business was distasteful to his meditative temper. As he heard in the services at church the command which

Christ addressed to the young man, respecting the sale of all his possessions and distribution to the poor, he gave the words a literal application to himself. All his property was disposed of, with the exception of a small sum which he retained for the benefit of his sister. Soon after, even this reserve was relinquished. Having intrusted his sister to a company of pious virgins, he betook himself to retirement, retreating from time to time more deeply into the wilderness, and finally taking up his abode on Mount Colzim, not far from the Red Sea. During his long life, — protracted, it is said, beyond the limit of a century, — he rarely left the wilderness. Two visits only to Alexandria are recorded, — the one, in 311, to strengthen Christians suffering from heathen persecution; the other, in 351, to enter a protest against Arianism.[1] As may be judged from this last instance, his absorbing practical aim did not quench his interest in the theological controversies of his time. An evidence to the same effect may be observed in a vision which troubled his mind shortly before the Arians, under the patronage of Constantius, took possession of the churches. According to his words to the brother monks who pressed for an explanation of his grief, he saw mules invading the sanctuary, trampling around with furious rout, and compassing on every side the table of the Lord.[2]

Anthony is reported to have said that "he who abideth in solitude is delivered from the threefold warfare of hearing, speaking, and seeing, and has only to support the combat against his own heart." It is quite possible, however, for a heart, distempered by lack of

[1] See Athansius, Vita Antonii, §§ 46, 69. [2] Vita Anton, § 82.

ordinary social relations, to supply more temptation than the senses commonly imbibe from the sphere of social intercourse. So the experience of Anthony himself seemed to prove. He labored hard to conquer rebellious nature: he clothed himself in haircloth and sheepskin; he slept on the ground, or, at best, on a pallet of straw; his daily allowance of food was no more than twelve ounces of bread; the luxury of bathing was repudiated; whole nights were frequently spent in prayer. But still, unsubdued by these austerities, the fire of an unhallowed nature continued to burn within. The hermit found himself tormented by worldly thoughts and images of impurity. A swarm of demons appeared to encompass him, and often to his glowing fancy they took the shape of visible bodily assailants, — such power has the intense inner life of natures peculiarly sensitive to create seemingly exterior objects! At length, however, Anthony came to understand that conflicts with demons, real as they may be, are largely shaped and colored by subjective conditions; and we find him teaching his brother monks that the demons lose their fearful shape and their power when the soul is uplifted to God in firm trust and confidence.

The life of Anthony in the wilderness did not exclude him from a very positive influence upon his age. His casual visits to the city produced a great effect upon the multitude, on account of his strange appearance and his repute for sanctity. Many also sought his wilderness retreat, for the benefit of his counsels. In most cases a fair reward was obtained for their pains; for Anthony was a good judge of human nature, and prescribed to inquirers with great practical

sagacity, as well as with entire honesty. He may fitly be ranked among the very first of his class. Rigorous in his treatment of himself, he was inclined to treat others with gentleness. The homage which he received was unsought, and seems never to have been a source of pride or elation; one of his last requests was that the place of his grave should be kept secret (a request signally disobeyed by the idolatrous generations of subsequent centuries, who carried about his relics). He had that soundness of spiritual perception which enabled him to reckon the moral above the marvellous. "It is not becoming," said he, "to glory in casting out devils, or in curing diseases, or to make much of him only who casts out devils, and to disparage him who does not."[1] His biographer narrates of him that "he united with the suffering in sympathy and prayer; and often, and in behalf of many, the Lord heard him. When heard, he did not boast; when denied his petition, he did not murmur, — but always himself gave thanks to the Lord, and exhorted the afflicted to be patient, and to understand that the prerogative to heal belonged neither to him nor to any man, but to God alone, who works when and for whom He pleases."[2]

Crude as is the figure which Anthony presents, when we look to various features of his asceticism, a species of grandeur pertained to the spirit and aim of his life. He struggled heroically for self-subjugation. And his struggle was not in vain. The temptations to self-righteousness incident to so legal a *régime* as is that of monastic austerities were nobly withstood by him. He

[1] Vita Anton., § 38.
[2] Ibid., § 56.

came to the close of life with a heart at once humble toward God, and not wanting in love to man.

The example of Anthony acted like contagion. Before his death, the deserts of Egypt, the headquarters of monasticism, had begun to be peopled with hermits. Neighboring countries followed the Egyptian precedent. Syria and Palestine early shared in the zeal for the new method of conquering the world and the devil. Hilarion was the first distinguished native leader whose influence went abroad over these regions.

An involuntary approach to the cloister life was made under Anthony, by reason of the monks who insisted upon being under his spiritual guidance, and located their cells in his neighborhood. But the founding of cloister life of the more definite and organized type is to be referred to Pachomius. It was by him that monastic principles were first embodied in a written rule. About 325, he instituted a society upon an island (Tabennæ) of the Nile, in Upper Egypt. Numerous branches arose. The whole society is said to have numbered fifty thousand members by the middle of the fifth century. Cloisters for nuns were also instituted, under the direction of Pachomius.

The following account of the origin and contents of the institutes of Pachomius is given by Sozomen: "It is said that Pachomius at first dwelt alone in a cave, but that a holy angel appeared to him, and commanded him to assemble some young monks, to instruct them in the practice of philosophy [that is, monasticism], and to inculcate the laws which were about to be delivered to him. A tablet was then given to him, which is still carefully preserved. Upon this tablet were inscribed

injunctions by which he was bound to permit every one to eat, to drink, to work, and to fast, according to his capability of so doing: those who ate heartily were to be subjected to arduous labor, and the ascetic were to have more easy tasks assigned them. He was commanded to have many cells erected, in each of which three monks were to dwell, who were to take their meals at a common refectory in silence, and with a veil thrown over their head and face, so that they might not be able to see each other or any thing but what was on or under the table. They were not to admit strangers to eat with them, with the exception of travellers, to whom they were to show hospitality. Those who wished to live with them were to undergo a probation of three years, during which time the most laborious and painful tasks were to be imposed upon them. They were to clothe themselves in skins, and to wear woollen tiaras adorned with purple nails, and linen tunics with girdles. They were to sleep in their tunics and garments of skins, reclining on long chairs closed on each side, which were to serve as couches.[1] On the first and last days of the week they were to approach the altar and partake of the communion of the holy mysteries, and were then to unloose their girdles and throw off their robes of skin. They were to pray twelve times every day, and as often during the evening, and were to offer up the same number of prayers during the night. The whole congregation was to be divided into twenty-four classes, each of which was to be distinguished by one of the letters of the Greek alphabet."[2]

[1] In the Rule, however, mention is made of mats (cap. lxxxviii.).
[2] Hist. Eccl., iii. 14.

The Rule of Pachomius is carried out into very minute specifications. Special care is manifest to exclude all notion of private property. The monk is even forbidden to have his own pair of tweezers for extracting thorns. As the monastic society of Pachomius speedily became very numerous, a gradation of officers was naturally recognized. The head of the parent society had a general supervision. A monastery which might contain thirty or forty houses, having each about forty monks, was presided over by an abbot, while each of the houses had its provost.

As the infection of monasticism spread, individuals became ambitious of higher grades of self-torture. In the fifth century, Symeon, a shepherd from the border of Syria and Cilicia, gave the first example of the Stylites, or pillar-saints. According to Theodoret, he was primarily incited to take his station upon a pillar by his desire to avoid the press of the people who thronged the ascetic, and sought to derive some benediction from his garments of skins. The same author states that he dwelt successively upon pillars six, twelve, twenty-two, and thirty-six cubits high.[1] The necessity of descending was obviated by the readiness of the people to carry up supplies. Thirty-six years are said to have been spent in this elevated pulpit, from which, by word and by the example of his self-tortures, Symeon preached to admiring crowds. Even this extreme of ascetic fanaticism found imitators. In the East, individual instances of pillar-saints appeared as late as the twelfth century. The West records but a single attempt of this sort, and that was cut short by the veto of the authorities.

[1] Hist. Relig., xxvi.

An intemperate emulation gave birth to still other forms of extravagance. Some had an ambition to convert themselves into praying-machines, like Paul the Simple, who daily recited three hundred prayers, the count being kept by means of pebbles. Some carried fasting as near as possible to the point of total abstinence from food. Of Heliodorus, it is said that he partook of food only one day in seven.[1] Some made a virtue of absolute solitude, like Akepsimas, who shut himself up in a little domicile where he spent sixty years, neither being seen by any one nor addressing any one, communing only with himself and with God. An oblique or winding aperture admitted the food which charity brought, without exposing him to the observation of the giver.[2] In some instances the sin against reason was requited by an actual overthrow of the faculty of reason. Evagrius speaks of a class of men who exposed themselves well nigh naked to extremes of heat and cold, and fed wholly upon the natural produce of the ground, until they became "assimilated to wild beasts, with their outward form altogether disfigured, and their mind in a state no longer fit for intercourse with their species."[3]

The more radical eccentricities of monasticism were left behind as it was transported to the West. Athanasius was among the first to encourage this transportation. His personal representations during his banishment, as also his biography of Anthony, awakened a considerable interest in the monastic life. Some visited the East to take example from the austerities there

[1] Sozomen, vi. 34. [2] Theodoret, Hist. Relig., xv.
[3] Hist. Eccl., i. 21.

practised. Cloisters arose in the neighborhood of Rome and in other parts of the West. The learned Jerome was an ardent propagandist at the great capital. His influence was especially effective among the patrician women of Rome. Following his exhortations, widowed matrons and virgins entered with great enthusiasm upon the ascetic life. Paula, the most noted of these, accompanied Jerome in his eastern sojourn, founded a monastery at Bethlehem, and established there also three nunneries. In Milan, Ambrose gave his voice in favor of monasticism. In Gaul, Martin of Tours, Honoratus, Saint Germain of Auxerre, and John Cassianus were its enthusiastic patrons. Augustine, as Bishop of Hippo, formed his clergy into a kind of monastic association; but his commendation of the cloistral life failed to secure for it any great consideration among the Christians of North Africa.[1]

An important era in the history of monasticism in the Latin Church was inaugurated by the life and institutes of Benedict of Nursia. This patriarch of Latin monks, as he may be called, was born at the Umbrian town just named, in the year 480. Forsaking the educational advantages which his family provided him at Rome, he entered while yet a youth upon the hermit life. Several years were spent by him in a solitary grot at Subiaco, a place eastward from the capital. His austerities soon acquired for him great celebrity. In response to earnest solicitations, he accepted the office

[1] Salvianus, De Gub. Dei, viii. 4, represents the African populace as assailing the monks with scurrility and curses. "Omnia in illos pene fecerunt quæ in Salvatorem nostrum Judæorum impietas ante fecit quam ad effusionem ipsam divini sanguinis perveniret."

of abbot in a cloister belonging to the neighborhood. His strictness not proving acceptable, he retired to his former haunt. But the numbers that came to him did not allow him to abide alone, and he was led to found several cloisters. These establishments, however, were quite overshadowed by that which arose under his auspices upon Monte Cassino, whither a vexatious opposition led him to retire. To this mountain the Benedictines of after-times were to look as to the consecrated source of the glory of their societies. A strict organic connection was not, indeed, established between the numerous cloisters which adopted the rule of Benedict and that of Monte Cassino. Each cloister was self-governed. But an intimate moral bond connected them with each other, and especially with the renowned parent society.

The mode of life prescribed by the rule of Benedict was not after the most rigid type of asceticism. A limited quantity of wine was allowed to the monks.[1] It lay within the discretion of the abbot, in consideration of special severity of labor, to issue rations exceeding the standard allowance.[2] To the weak and the sick, the eating of flesh was conceded. While it was designed to keep the monks very fully occupied, the tedium of their employment was relieved by an alternation of devotion and study with manual labor. For the more cultured, teaching became a part of the ordinary duties

[1] At the same time it was intimated that to dispense with its use would better suit their vocation (Regula, cap. xl.). Pachomius allowed no wine except to the sick (Reg. Pachom., cap. xlv.).

[2] The standard daily fare was a pound of bread, two cooked dishes, — that is, of vegetables, grain, eggs, or fish, — and one uncooked dish (cap. xxxix.).

of the cloister, especially after Cassiodorus, in the sixth century, had given prominence to this feature. A sufficient circle of industries was embraced to secure a large measure of independence. "The monastery," says Montalembert, "like a citadel always besieged, was to have within its enclosure gardens, a mill, a bakery, and various workshops, in order that no necessity of material life should occasion the monks to leave the walls."[1] Even epistolary intercourse with the outside world could not take place, except by the permit of the abbot.[2] The giving or receiving of presents was under like restriction.

In the management of the cloister, the abbot, who was to be elected by the fraternity, was the chief authority. It was provided, however, that in matters of importance he should consult the assembly of the brethren.[3] Where the establishment was very large, deans might be appointed.[4] The distribution of food, and the supervision in general of the routine of material affairs, was under the charge of an officer called the cellarer.[5] Admission to the cloister was to be preceded by a year's probation.[6] If at the end of this term the candidate appeared acceptable, and was decided in his choice of the monastic life, he sealed this choice by subscribing the vow of the society. By this vow he was obligated to perpetual adherence to the monastic life,

[1] Monks of the West, Book IV. Compare the language of the Rule: "Monasterium, si potest fieri, ita debet constitui, ut omnia necessaria, id est, aqua, molendinum, hortus, pistrinum, vel artes diversæ, intra monasterium exerceantur, ut non sit necessitas monachis vagandi foras, quia omnino non expedit animabus eorum" (cap. lxvi.).

[2] Cap. liv. [3] Cap. iii. [4] Cap. xxi. [5] Cap. xxxi. [6] Cap. lviii.

to poverty and chastity, and to unquestioning obedience to the abbot.

The strong emphasis laid upon the irrevocable nature of the vow, upon the obligation to perpetual adherence to the order, appears as a distinguishing feature of the Benedictine system. In the times preceding Benedict, it had, indeed, been counted a kind of misdemeanor to forsake an open pledge to the celibate or monastic life; but such a pledge, as Alzog remarks,[1] was not counted strictly irrevocable. This seems to be conceded by a canon of the council of Chalcedon; for, while it ordains in general that a nun or monk who may presume to marry shall be excommunicated, it gives the bishop the prerogative to exercise mildness in reference to such.[2] In commenting on this canon, Hefele remarks that it assumes the validity of the marriage of a monk, contrary to the later jurisprudence of the Church.[3]

Benedict was never ordained to the priesthood. In this he remained true to the original character of monasticism, as pre-eminently an institution for laymen.[4] There was a tendency, however, to depart from this feature. The number of the ordained among the monks was often increased beyond the requirements of the individual society. The journey from the cloister to the episcopal throne became of frequent occurrence.

[1] Kirchengeschichte, § 142. [2] Canon 16.

[3] § 200. He states also that a marriage contracted by priests was regarded as valid till the beginning of the twelfth century.

[4] Cassianus lays down as an approved maxim for monks, that they should keep equally clear of the ordaining hands of bishops and of the society of women: "Hæc est antiquitus patrum permanens nunc usque sententia, omnimodis monachum fugere debere mulieres et episcopos." (*De Cœnob. Instit.*, xi. 16.)

A large share of ecclesiastical work fell to the monks; and finally, in the Middle Ages, they were currently assigned a species of clerical standing.

The Rule of Benedict was unmistakably a source of far-reaching influence. It organized the ascetic fervor of the age. It became the model in a long line of training-schools, extending over the breadth of Europe, and serving as a leading factor in preparing for the Church a host of distinguished missionaries, scholars, and prelates.

3. Contemporary Estimates. — Utterances in disparagement of the superior claims of monasticism were occasionally heard. A great diversity of motives lay back of these. The frivolous and luxurious sometimes criticised because the ascetic life was looked upon as more or less of a protest or attack against their practices. The Emperor Valens complained that men made use of the monastic profession to escape their duties to the State; and there were also others who based their opposition upon the charge of detriment to the interests of the body politic. Meanwhile, a few, who approached the subject from a moral and religious stand-point, felt obliged to deny that any exceptional sanctity or worth pertains to the monastic life. To this class belonged Jovinian, Helvidius, and Vigilantius. Though a monk himself, Jovinian was disgusted with the high-sounding claims which were urged in behalf of his order, and openly declared against them. According to Jerome, who was a bitter antagonist, he maintained that "virgins, widows, and married persons, who have once been baptized into Christ, have equal merit, other things in

their conduct being equal;" and that "there is no difference between abstaining from food, and enjoying it with thanksgiving."[1] In fine, Jovinian had an excellent apprehension of the gospel truth, that sanctity is no monopoly of a peculiar mode of living, but is equally attainable in any and every legitimate vocation. Unhappily, however, his emphasis upon the equality of all genuine Christians led him into a denial, by far too sweeping, of spiritual gradations among the regenerate.

Jovinian and his fellow critics found the current against them too strong to be turned back. Monasticism moved on as a great tendency of the age, and compelled in general the acceptance and homage of Christendom. Even the considerate and sober-minded, who maintained with emphasis that the life in family relations is a good thing, were inclined to regard the life of celibacy and abstinence as a higher good, something peculiarly favorable to spiritual perfection. With men of enthusiastic temper, no terms seemed too strong to proclaim the glory of the monastic ideal. Jerome, while urging his friend Heliodorus to abandon the world, taught that piety toward parents is impiety toward God, when it stands in the way of the monastic profession. "Though thy mother," he writes, "with dishevelled hair and torn garments, points to the bosom by which thou wast nurtured, though thy father should lie upon the threshold, proceed thou, treading over thy father. . . . O desert blooming with the flowers of Christ! O solitude where those stones are prepared with which is built up the city of the Great King! O desert rejoicing in the society of God! What doest thou, my brother,

[1] Adv. Jovin., i. 3.

in the city, with thy soul greater than the world? How long wilt thou abide under the shadow of roofs? How long wilt thou be confined by the dungeon of smoky cities?"[1] In his correspondence with Roman ladies, outbursts of like enthusiasm occur; indeed, he lauds their ascetic purposes in such lavish style as might almost lead them to think, that, in embracing the monastic life, they had transcended the measure of human virtue, and had become a species of divinities. The less impulsive Ambrose also gives a glowing account of the monastic life. Speaking of the haunts of the monks in the Mediterranean islands, he says, "In those isles, thrown by God like a collar of pearls upon the sea, those who would escape from the charms of dissipation find refuge. There they fly from the world, they live in austere moderation, they escape the ambushes of this life. The sea offers them, as it were, a veil and a secret asylum for their mortifications. She helps them to win and to defend perfect continence. There every thing excites austere thoughts. Nothing disturbs their peace: all access is closed to the wild passions of the world. The mysterious sound of the waves mingles with the chant of hymns; and, while the waters break upon the shore of these happy islands with a gentle murmur, the peaceful accents of the choir of the elect ascend towards heaven from their bosom."[2] Chrysostom gives an equally enticing description of monastic isolation from the tumults of the world. "Alone in the haven," he says of the monks, "while the tempest swells, they dwell in great tranquillity and security, and look as it

[1] Epist. xiv., Ad Heliodorum.

[2] Hexaëm., iii. 5, as somewhat freely rendered by Montalembert.

were from heaven itself upon the shipwreck of other men. For they have chosen a kind of life worthy of heaven, and they obtain a state not inferior to the angelic. They have all things common, — table, domicile, vestments. Nor is this to be wondered at, since in all there is one and the same mind. All are noble with the same nobility, servants with the same servitude, free with the same liberty."[1] In one of his homilies, the same writer exclaims, "Heaven is not so glorious with the varied choir of the stars as the wilderness of Egypt, exhibiting to us all around the tents of the monks."[2] The historians of the time wrote in a kindred tone of eulogy. Rufinus, in his "Historia Monachorum," ascribes the most astonishing deeds to the hermits, crediting them, among other things, with a complete dominion over wild and ferocious beasts. Sozomen uses these unstinted terms: "Those who at this period had embraced monasticism manifested the glory of the Church, and evidenced the truth of their doctrines, by their virtuous line of conduct. Indeed, the most useful thing which has been received by man from God is their philosophy."[3] He credits the monks with many marvellous things, giving, for example, this entertaining account of the Egyptian monk Apelles: "He worked as a smith at the forge; and one night, when he was engaged at this employment, the devil undertook to tempt him to incontinence, by appearing before him in the form of a woman. Apelles, however, seized the iron which was heating in the furnace, and burnt the face of the devil, who screamed wildly and ran away."[4] Evagrius applies a like esti-

[1] Adv. Oppugnat. Vit. Monast., iii. 11.
[2] Hom. in Matt., viii.
[3] Hist. Eccl., i. 12.
[4] Hist. Eccl., vi. 28.

mate to monasticism and monastics, and speaks of Symeon the stylite as "that angel upon earth, that citizen, in the flesh, of the heavenly Jerusalem."[1] Theodoret, in his history of thirty distinguished monks, expresses unbounded admiration of the men "who in a mortal and passible body appeared impassible, and emulated the incorporeal nature." His narrative, too, is plentifully sprinkled with accounts of miracles. He describes, for example, how James of Nisibis dried up a stream by his curse, and brought premature tokens of old age upon some maidens who were washing their garments in the same, because they had failed to treat him with becoming modesty and reverence; how he was ready to undo the curse, and answered the request of the people that the stream should be restored. "Such," remarks the historian, "was the miracle of this new Moses, which indeed was not wrought by the stroke of a rod, but by the sign of the cross."[2] Reference might also be made to flattering tributes of emperors who deigned to consult some noted recluse on the most important affairs of the State, or enacted laws in behalf of the monastic profession.[3]

It should be observed, however, that some who were most free in their encomiums give evidence that many of the monks were by no means patterns of purity and self-denial. The same Jerome who exhausts rhetoric in praise of monasticism speaks of those whose excessive austerities had induced a chronic melancholy; of others

[1] Hist. Eccl., i. 13. [2] Hist. Relig., i.

[3] So Justinian, in prohibiting one member of a household from placing restraint upon another wishing to enter the monastic life. (*Novella* cxxiii.; *Cod.*, I. iii. 53; I. iii. 55.)

who veiled a worldly heart and a luxurious life under the cloak of the solitary, and made spoil out of the too ready confidence of nobles and women; of others whose pride expressed itself in uncharitable judgments, in disdain toward their ecclesiastical superiors, and in frequenting of public places in order that their piety might be duly exhibited and admired.[1]

4. Contributions to Christendom. — Augustine testified, as the result of his own observation, that the best and the worst of men were to be found among monks. A similar variety may be affirmed of the contributions of monasticism, as a whole, to the life and thought of the Church. Whatever may be its place, or lack of place, under more normal conditions of society, it unquestionably had a certain mission in the era of abnormal conditions to which the more conspicuous part of its history belongs. Its protest against worldliness, if eccentric and one-sided, was still in many instances earnest, and administered a stimulus to the religious sentiment in not a few minds. Its cloisters performed an important part, as recruiting stations for the missionary field. It brought waste districts under cultivation, and in an age of decline supplied the best examples of agriculture to be found in Europe. In times of disruption and disorganization, it provided for learning numerous sanctuaries, which even rude warriors respected, and thus served as an instrument for handing down the literary treasures of antiquity. It is not easy to over-estimate the conserving office fulfilled by the transcribers whom the cloisters educated and sheltered.

[1] See in particular, Epist. cxxv.

On the other hand, however, there were pernicious results growing out of monasticism. As it advanced in popularity, its greatest commendation — namely, its moral earnestness — too often succumbed; and the cloister, which was founded as a seminary of virtue, degenerated into a school of vice. By the unhealthy isolation which it prescribed, it ministered oftentimes to an abnormal thirst after the magical, and was instrumental in burdening the Church with overgrown lists of spurious miracles. Finally, its association of special sanctity with a special style of living tended to becloud the minds of men as respects their conceptions of Christian privilege and duty. Emphasis was unduly withdrawn from the grand idea of sanctifying the ordinary relations and business of life. Indications early appear of the judgment that only monks can be expected to be religious in a very eminent degree, and that the ordinary Christian does very well in being content with a lower standard.

VI. — REPRESENTATIVE MEN.

In a full catalogue of the distinguished men of the era it would be appropriate to mention Didymus, who, in spite of blindness, became a distinguished teacher in the theological school of Alexandria; Cyril of Jerusalem, a theologian of more than average fruitfulness; Ephræm, the leading poet and divine of Syria in the fourth century, whose mystical piety and enthusiastic asceticism had much influence upon the people of that region; and Hilary of Poitiers, one of the most prominent and steadfast champions of the orthodox faith

which the Latin Church supplied against Arianism. But we pass by these, and many others, and limit our attention to those whose character and influence in a special degree summon to an interested attention.

ATHANASIUS. — "The victorious Athanasius, who had acquired as many crowns as he had engaged in conflicts," — such was the verdict of Theodoret as he reviewed his career. Alert, incisive, eloquent, possessed of indomitable perseverance, great in soul (though small in body), Athanasius was well fitted to make a deep impress upon his own and upon succeeding ages.

As a theologian and a controversialist, the great Alexandrian was not altogether above the faulty polemics of the age. He applied harsh and contemptuous epithets to his Arian opponents. But that may be said of him which cannot be said of some of those opponents; namely, that his violence was confined to words, and did not pass on into deeds. He showed himself, however, abundantly capable of calm argumentation; and, if he sometimes used fiery words, there was, at least, back of them the fire of a great conviction. He believed that the divinity of Christ was the sacred ark of Christianity; that no perfect mediation can be secured, that Christianity cannot claim to be the absolute religion, unless the divine essence was truly in Christ. "From this point of view," says Baur, "Athanasius apprehended the gist of the controversy; always finally summing up all his objections to the Arian doctrine with the chief argument, that the whole substance of Christianity, all reality of redemption, every thing which makes Christianity the perfect salvation, would be utterly

null and meaningless if He who is supposed to unite man with God in real unity of being were not Himself absolute God, or of one substance with the absolute God, but only a creature among creatures."[1]

As an administrator, Athanasius was possessed of eminent tact. Few men could have steered with a firmer hand through such a seething whirlpool of agitation and passion as was Alexandria in his time. Gibbon, while he sees in his dogmatic zeal a token of fanaticism, emphatically acknowledges his capacity to rule. "Athanasius," he says, "displayed a superiority of character and abilities, which would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy."[2]

Athanasius may also be viewed as the hero of perilous encounters and romantic adventures. A mark for slanderous accusations, five times exiled from his charge, pursued even with murderous intent by his foes, he had abundant occasion to employ all the resources of a versatile genius. A noted example of his skill in foiling a plot appears in his answer to a council of bishops at Tyre. This council was bent upon his overthrow, and charged him with having murdered a certain Arsenius; also with having atrociously mutilated his body by cutting off the right hand. Fortunately for the accused bishop, Arsenius was discovered, and held subject to the order of Athanasius. Having obtained the testimony of certain in the council that they knew the mutilated man, he brought him into their presence, and obtained their reluctant acknowledgment that this seemed to be the very person in question. "Then, turning back the

[1] Kirchengeschichte, ii. 97. [2] Chap. xxi.

cloak of Arsenius on one side, Athanasius shows one of the man's hands; again, while some were supposing that the other hand was wanting, after permitting them to remain a short time in doubt, he turned back the cloak on the other side and exposed the other hand. Then, addressing himself to those present, he said, 'Arsenius, as you see, is found to have two hands; let my accusers show the place where the third was cut off.'"[1] The fertility of Athanasius in expedients suited to the emergency is evidenced, among other things, by his reputation for magic, as implying the belief that his own wit was supplemented by that of the devil. No doubt his own wit was effectually aided, but the aid came from the invincible fidelity of his many friends. "No fugitive Stuart in the Scottish Highlands," says Stanley, "could count more securely on the loyalty of his subjects, than did Athanasius, in his hiding-places in Egypt, count upon the faithfulness and secrecy of his countrymen. His whole course was that of an adventurous and wandering prince, rather than of a persecuted theologian; and when, in the brief intervals of triumph, he was enabled to return to his native city, his entrance was like that of a sovereign rather than of a prelate."[2]

Basil and the two Gregories. — These three contemporaries may well be grouped together, not only on account of their intimate relations to each other, but also in view of their moral and intellectual kinship.

Basil, who like Athanasius was honored by later generations with the title Great, was born about the year

[1] Socrates, Hist. Eccl., i. 29.

[2] History of the Eastern Church, Lect. vii.

329. As his death occurred in 379, his whole life was passed in the intense era of the Arian struggle. However, it was only in the last nine of his fifty years, the time of his episcopate, that he was a prominent figure in the great controversy. Up to middle life he was occupied with the labors of the school and the cloister.

The best of literary advantages fell to the lot of Basil. From the tuition of his father, who was a rhetorician, he passed under that of Libanius at Constantinople, and then studied for several years at Athens. These advantages were well improved. Contact with classic culture had no such effect upon him as upon his fellow-student at Athens, the prince Julian. Leaving his Christian devotion undiminished, his liberal studies were transmuted into an aid and ornament to the Christian calling. They supplied polish and edge to the sword which he wielded for the truth of the gospel. "The style of Basil," says Milman, "did no discredit to his Athenian education; in purity and perspicuity he surpassed most of the heathen, as well as the Christian writers of his age."[1] Basil did not forget his obligations to the classics. We find him in later years commending the study of the ancient poets and philosophers. He is careful, indeed, to warn against the infection which might be drawn from the less judicious of their sayings; at the same time, he gives full credit to the healthy stimulus and development which may be derived from the masters of classic literature.[2]

In Basil generally we recognize the man of breadth and liberality. There is somewhat in the tone of his

[1] History of Christianity, Book III., chap. ix.
[2] Sermo de Legendis Libris Gentilium.

writings which reminds of Origen. He did not have the genius or speculative daring of Origen; but we may discern in him something of the same poise, magnanimity, and gentleness, which attract us toward the distinguished Alexandrian. He was a man of more than ordinary fineness of sensibility. One token of this appears in his sympathetic feeling for the beauties of nature,[1] — a trait which we should hardly expect to find in the age of controversialists and monks.

Considerable celebrity attaches to the name of Basil in connection with monasticism. Several ascetic writings, among them a rule for the cloistral life, came from his hand. The rule prescribes a sufficiently severe *régime*; at the same time, it falls short of the extreme of monastic austerity, and exhibits special touches of enlightened piety. In one of its specifications, strong emphasis is given to the idea that the life of the solitary is far less compatible with the cultivation of Christian virtue than life in society.[2]

Basil, as bishop of Cæsarea and metropolitan of Cappadocia, displayed eminent abilities for administration. His steadfastness against the demands of Valens is numbered among the celebrated episodes of the Arian controversy. The Emperor was making use of a tour through the East to depose the orthodox bishops. The prætorian prefect Modestus, who travelled ahead, was instructed to present to such the alternative of communicating with the Arians or the penalty of deposition. Having tried in vain to flatter Basil into acquiescence, he at last rose up in anger, and asked him if he did not fear his power.

[1] See Epist., xiv. [2] Regulæ Fusius Tractatæ, vii.

Basil. — Fear what consequences? what sufferings?

Modestus. — One of those many pains which a prefect can inflict.

Basil. — Let me know them.

Modestus. — Confiscation, exile, tortures, death.

Basil. — Think of some other threat. These have no influence upon me. He runs no risk of confiscation who has nothing to lose except these mean garments and a few books. Nor does he care for exile who is not circumscribed by place, who does not make a home of the spot he dwells in, but everywhere a home whithersoever he be cast, or rather everywhere God's home, whose pilgrim he is and wanderer. Nor can tortures harm a frame so frail as to break under the first blow. You could but strike once, and death would be gain. It would but send me the sooner to Him for whom I live and labor, for whom I am dead rather than alive, to whom I have long been journeying.[1]

In describing Basil, we have also to a large extent described the two Gregories. Probably neither of them was the equal of Basil in administrative talents. But in other respects they were nearly akin, possessed with the same scholarly affinities, the same poetic sensibility and love of nature, the same appreciation of the monastic ideal.

Gregory Nazianzen, like others of the eminent men of this age, — a Chrysostom, a Theodoret, an Augustine, — enjoyed in childhood and youth the sanctifying impress of a mother's fervent piety. A dream of his early days, in which purity and sobriety took the form of angelic visitants, indicates the thoughts which were then in his

[1] See J. H. Newman, Historical Sketches, vol. iii.

mind, as well as the ideal that was before him in maturer years. Like Basil, Gregory availed himself of the best literary advantages of his age, visiting, among other renowned seats of learning, the schools of Athens. His most conspicuous positions in the Church were those which he occupied as pastor of an orthodox congregation in Constantinople, at a time when the city was overrun with Arianism, and later as patriarch of the same metropolis. The latter position, however, was very soon resigned, owing to exhibitions of jealousy and captious opposition. He figured to some extent as a poet, but won his greatest distinction as a pulpit orator. He cannot be excused from a certain rhetorical extravagance, but may be ranked, nevertheless, after Chrysostom, among the principal lights of sacred oratory in the Greek Church.

Gregory of Nyssa, a younger brother of Basil, is known chiefly for his literary productiveness. In this field he served as a champion of trinitarianism; but his thinking was not always in the line of orthodoxy. His bent to idealism reminds of Origen, some of whose peculiar opinions he imbibed.

Chrysostom. — John, surnamed Chrysostom, or the Golden-mouthed, was born at Antioch in 347. His mother, Anthusa, was left a widow soon after his birth, and made it henceforth the chief object of her life to perfect the intellectual and religious education of her son. His literary training was conducted under no less a master than the renowned Libanius. As being a mode of life well suited to his rhetorical proficiency, he first chose the calling of an advocate. But he was not

long in deciding that this was an uncongenial sphere; and, following the bent of his heart, he dedicated himself wholly to the service of religion. The persuasions of his mother detained him at Antioch till her death, after which he fulfilled a cherished desire, and sought a refuge among the monks dwelling on the mountains near the city. Six years devoted to study and meditation were spent in this retreat, when loss of health gave him a pressing occasion to return to Antioch. Here he was ordained presbyter, and in this office became at once a great light of the pulpit. In 397 the fame of his eloquence caused his election to the office of patriarch of Constantinople. To this elevated position he brought the same simple and abstinent mode of life to which he had previously adhered, and was alert to promote every interest commended to his superintendence. "John," says Theodoret, "had no sooner received the helm of the Church, than he began to rebuke crime with much boldness. He gave many useful counsels to the emperor and the empress; he obliged the priests to observe the canons of the Church, and prohibited those who violated them from approaching the altar."[1] His fidelity to his responsibilities was rewarded with the fervent attachment of the better part of the clergy, monks, and people. But, on the other hand, it aroused a relentless opposition. The proud and headstrong empress was offended by the admonitions of the courageous bishop: the more worldly among the clergy disliked his moral strictness; the envious bishop of Alexandria took occasion of the Origenistic controversy to begin a crusade against him; and so it resulted that gross injustice

[1] Hist. Eccl., v. 28.

triumphed, and Chrysostom, in 404, was banished to Cucusus, an inhospitable region on the borders of Isauria, Cilicia, and Armenia. Not content with inflicting this banishment, envy and malice sought to drive him into the grave, and succeeded. An attempt to transfer him to Pityus, situated in the neighborhood of Colchis, and upon the very verge of the Empire, proved fatal to the enfeebled prelate, and he died upon the way (407). His remains were deposited at Comana in Pontus. Fourteen centuries later the same place received the remains of the Protestant missionary Henry Martyn, in like manner worn out by sickness and by journeying beyond his strength.[1]

The justice which was denied to the living was soon rendered to the dead. We find, indeed, several years after his decease, that most unsaintly saint, Cyril of Alexandria, still railing against Chrysostom. "He did not hesitate, in a letter still extant, to compare the great Confessor to Judas, and to affirm that the restoraation of his name to the episcopal roll would be like paying honor to the traitor instead of recognizing Matthias."[2] Cyril, however, lived to see the day when the

[1] J. H. Newman, Historical Sketches. Newman adds: "Let us trust that that zealous preacher came under the shadow of the Catholic doctor, that he touched the bones of Eliseus, and that, all errors forgiven, he lives to God through the intercession of the Confessor, to whom in place and manner of death he was united." We can appreciate the benevolent intent of this comment, but we protest that the Romanist herein does honor neither to Chrysostom nor to Christianity. According to a broad and spiritual view, the union of each of the two men in heart and purpose with Christ is a sufficient guaranty, without the intervention of a human shadow or intercession, of their union in the fruition of the immortal life.

[2] Ibid.

remains of Chrysostom were brought in state to Constantinople, and when the Emperor, with his face laid upon the coffin, acknowledged and deplored the sin of his parents in having persecuted the noble bishop.

In the domain of doctrine, Chrysostom exhibits in their purity the peculiarities of the Greek type. The freedom of the individual, and his ability to meet and to co-operate with God in the work of personal reformation, are prominent ideas in his system. He appears strongly impressed with the need, as well as with the glorious fruits, of divine grace, but still makes room for the human factor. He stands in clear contrast with the Latin type as represented by Augustine, in that he does not predicate such a sharp antagonism between nature and grace, is less impressed with the moral solidarity of the race, and does not concede such an overwhelming weight to divine sovereignty.

In the field of exegesis, Chrysostom stands as an eminent representative of the Syrian or Antiochian school, the school of his teacher Diodorus, of his early associate Theodore of Mopsuestia, and of his warm admirer Theodoret. The grand characteristic of this school was its comparative freedom from allegorical interpretations, and its careful attention to grammar and history as the great essentials in exegesis.

The chief distinction of Chrysostom, however, pertains to him as the exponent and advocate of practical Christianity; and in this line of effort the pulpit was his throne. He was one of the great preachers of righteousness. "Chrysostom," says Milman, "was the model of a preacher for a great capital. Clear, rather than profound, his dogmatic is essentially moulded upon

his moral teaching. He is the champion, not so exclusively of any system of doctrines, as of Christian holiness against the vices, the dissolute manners, the engrossing love of amusement, which prevailed in the New Rome of the East. His doctrines flow naturally from his subject, or from the passage of Scripture under discussion; his illustrations are copious and happy; his style, free and fluent; while he is an unrivalled master in that rapid and forcible application of incidental occurrences, which gives such life and reality to eloquence. He is at times, in the highest sense, dramatic in his manner."[1]

An earnest purpose lay back of the words of Chrysostom. "I am always," says Photius," in admiration of that thrice-blessed man, because he ever, in all his writings, puts before him, as his object, to be useful." It was his constant endeavor to lead the people to a genuine imitation of Christ, and not merely to a formal and ritualistic Christianity. Purity in heart and in deed was his chosen theme. The surest way to correct an error of the head was, in his view, a good life, since such a life would draw down the favor and special guidance of God. An oft-repeated maxim of his was that nothing outward can by itself work any harm to the man of steadfast faith and purpose; and, in his courageous fidelity to his convictions, he lived as if he believed his maxim. The principle which in one connection he brought forward, and supported by reference to the arts of war and medicine, — namely, that peculiar circumstances may justify, in view of a holy and benevolent aim, a species of accommodation, or departure from the

[1] History of Christianity, Book III., chap. ix.

truth, — is rather to be esteemed a piece of ill-advised casuistry than an index of the spirit of the man. The whole bent of Chrysostom was toward an open, fearless, unflinching adherence to the truth, regardless of consequences. The words uttered by him upon the eve of his banishment were no empty boast. "There are many waves," he said, "and a violent flood; but we are not afraid of being overwhelmed, for we stand upon the rock. Let the sea rage, it cannot break the rock in pieces; let the waves mount up, the ship of Jesus cannot go down. Tell me, what is there to fear? Is it death? Christ is my life, and dying is my gain. Is it banishment? The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. Is it the loss of earthly goods? We have brought nothing into the world, and we can carry nothing out. I regard not the fearful things of this world, and look with disdain upon its glory." [1] In a like tone of steadfastness and religious confidence, he wrote from his place of exile to Olympias: "I do not despair of happier times, considering that He is at the helm of the universe who overcomes the storm, not by human skill, but by His *fiat*. If He does not do so at once, this is because it is His rule to take this course; and when evils have increased and reached their fulness, and a change is despaired of by the many, then to work His marvellous and strange work, manifesting the power which is His prerogative, while exercising withal the endurance of the afflicted. Never be cast down, then; for one thing alone is fearful, that is sin." [2]

[1] Quoted in Neander's Chrysostomus.
[2] Quoted in Newman's Historical Sketches.

THEODORET was born at Antioch about 390. In early manhood he became bishop of Cyros in Syria. His death occurred a few years after the council of Chalcedon. During a large part of his public life, he was an object of bitter attack because of his friendly attitude toward Nestorius. He had, indeed, no favor for the heresy ascribed to Nestorius; but he did not believe that Nestorius entertained that heresy. It was first at Chalcedon, where the furious tide of passion and invective whelmed every attempt to save one's own reputation for orthodoxy, while showing any consideration for the persecuted and exiled patriarch, that he consented to join in the anathema against Nestorius. This act looks like a trespass against conviction. It is possible, however, that Theodoret finally came to doubt the orthodoxy of Nestorius. If a certain passage in his "Heretical Fables" is genuine, such a conclusion cannot well be avoided.

In principles and character, Theodoret exhibited a certain kinship with Chrysostom. He had much the same elasticity of spirit. Unlike Basil and the Gregories, in whom there was a vein of sedate meditation, or even of sadness, he impresses one as a man of cheerful confidence and restless endeavor. Less intense and eloquent than Chrysostom, he was more versatile. As bishop, preacher, historian, and commentator, he was almost equally eminent. The transformation which he wrought in his diocese is a signal testimony to his ability and industry. As he himself recounted, when compelled by the tongue of the slanderer to speak of himself, he greatly forwarded the material interests of the people, building porticoes, bridges, baths, and an aque-

duct. At the same time he pushed the work of Christian instruction with such vigor that thousands of heretics were gained for the Church. "I brought over to the truth," he says, "eight villages of Marcionites, and others in their neighborhood, and with their free consent. Another village filled with Eunomians, another filled with Arians, I led into the light of divine knowledge. And, by God's grace, not even one blade of heretical cockle is left among us. Nor have I accomplished this without personal danger. Often have I shed my blood; often have I been stoned by them, nay, brought down before my time to the very gates of death."[1]

In the credulity which Theodoret exhibits in some of his writings, he shared the infirmity of his age. In his moderation and regard for fair dealing, he was honorably distinguished among the men of his age. "He had large sympathies," says Newman, "keen sensibilities, an indignation at the sight of tyranny, an impatience at wrong, a will of his own, a zeal for the triumph of the truth. He was as genuine a saint as some of those whose names are in the calendar."

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan from 374 to 397, might be termed the Cyprian of the fourth century. He was an able and resolute administrator, who nobly sustained the episcopal dignity. The majesty of his righteous dealing with the Emperor Theodosius has already engaged our attention. Another instance of inflexible bearing toward the great of the world appears in his relations to the Empress Justina. To her persistent

[1] Epist. lxxxi., quoted by Newman.

demand that one of the churches of Milan should be given over to an Arian service, he opposed an uncompromising refusal. He also declared to the usurper Maximus that he could not receive him into the communion of the Church till he had done penance for the murder of the Emperor Gratian. Ambrose knew well the limits of his authority. He had no wish to interfere with the secular power in its own domain. At the same time he had high conceptions of the prerogatives of the spiritual power, and was not deterred by purple robes and jewelled crowns from asserting them. In this sense we may accept the words of Milman: "Ambrose was the spiritual ancestor of the Hildebrands and Innocents."[1]

As a thinker and writer, Ambrose was not distinguished by originality or by superiority to the current of his age. In some of his productions his liberal borrowing from the Greek Fathers is decidedly perceptible. He came by a sudden transition from the secular to the ecclesiastical sphere, and took opinions in the latter pretty much as he found them. "It would seem," says Robertson, "that on his sudden elevation he yielded himself without suspicion or reserve to the tendencies of that fashion of religion which he found prevailing; and from the combination of this with his naturally lofty and energetic character resulted a mixture of qualities which might almost seem incompatible, — of manliness, commanding dignity, and strong practical sense, with a fanciful mysticism and a zealous readiness to encourage and forward the growing superstitions of

[1] History of Christianity, Book III., chap. x.

the age."[1] As an organizer of church music and a writer of hymns, Ambrose undoubtedly rendered a very valuable service. He marks an era in Latin hymnology.

JEROME was born about the year 340, in Dalmatia. His education was conducted under competent masters at Rome. In early manhood, monastic zeal led him to the desert of Chalcis in Syria. Here he studied Hebrew and Chaldee. Proceeding thence, he visited Antioch, where he was ordained priest; Constantinople, where he listened to the eloquence of Gregory Nazianzen; and, finally, Rome, where he became secretary of the bishop Damasus. Leaving Rome in 385, after a tour through Palestine and Egypt, he took up his abode in a monastery at Bethlehem. Here he remained till his death, in 419 or 420.

An experience of Jerome in the early part of his monastic life indicates the bent of his taste and genius. He dreamed that he was suddenly caught up and ushered through the midst of shining immortals into the presence of the Judge. Being asked concerning his state, he replied, "I am a Christian." "Thou liest," said the Judge: "thou art a Ciceronian." And with that he commanded the terror-stricken culprit to be scourged. He, on his part, ceased not to cry for mercy, till at length the heavenly attendants interceded in his behalf. He was released on his solemn promise to keep clear henceforth of secular literature.[2] The imaginary ordeal made a vivid impression upon Jerome for the time being. He believed that it was a visitation from

[1] History of the Church, Book II., chap. v.
[2] Epist. xxii. 30, Ad Eustochium.

God. Indeed, he claimed that he still felt, after he awoke, the painful impress of the scourge upon his body. In later years, however, he found it very convenient to treat the matter as a simple dream. He remained to the end a Ciceronian. Mastery of words, rhetorical skill, a fondness and an aptitude for brilliant paragraphs, continued to be distinguishing features of his genius.

In learning, Jerome surpassed all the Latin Fathers of the period. He was especially proficient in linguistic studies, and so was prepared for the extensive tasks which he accomplished as a commentator, and, above all, as the author of the standard Latin version of the Bible, the Vulgate. As a thinker, he must be assigned a less eminent rank. The quality of his mind is better described as alertness or smartness, than as profundity.

The character of Jerome cannot endure well a close inspection. To say nothing of the outrageous profanation of taste which appears in his communications to Roman ladies, and which, perhaps, argues rather a mental than a moral infirmity, he gave many and most unwholesome manifestations of passion and self-conceit. In dealing with an opponent, he knew nothing of the claims of charity. He was sure to push criticism into savage abuse where he was not confronted by one whom he felt to be a match for himself. So glaring are the flaws in his record, that Newman does not shun to intimate that nothing short of the verdict of an infallible Church could warrant belief in his saintship.[1]

[1] Historical Sketches, iii. 173. His words are: "I do not scruple to say, that, were he not a saint, there are words and ideas in his writings from which I should shrink; but, as he *is* a saint, I shrink with greater reason from putting myself in opposition, even in minor matters and

AUGUSTINE belonged to that class of men whom the march of centuries and of civilizations never leaves behind. Probably among all who have followed the apostles, no one has exercised a wider influence. The scholastics of the Middle Ages paid homage to him as the great theological master. The foremost leaders of the Protestant Reformation drew from his writings as from no other ancient treasury, the Scriptures alone excepted. Those who disagree with him on some points are glad to appeal to him upon others, and he is still frequently quoted both by Protestants and Roman Catholics. Such breadth of influence argues, of course, a corresponding breadth and fertility of nature. Augustine was a man of extraordinary endowments. Deep thought in him was united with deep sentiment, the head of iron with the heart of flame, high intellectuality with consecrated emotion. The tone of his writings is a prominent element in their worth, as well as the thousand gems of philosophical and theological wisdom which they contain. In the broad circle of his ideas, very serious errors, it is true, were included; and the homage commanded before the majesty and riches of

points of detail, to one who has the *magisterium* of the Church pledged to his saintly perfection. I cannot, indeed, force myself to approve or like these particulars on my private judgment or feeling; but I can receive things on faith against both the one and the other. And I readily and heartily do take on faith these characteristics, words, or acts of this great doctor of the universal Church, and think it not less acceptable to God or to him to give him my religious homage than my human praise." A peculiar illustration, surely, of that broad and roomy freedom which Newman invites his Protestant readers to expect in the Romish Church! A peculiar specimen, too, of a voluntary abasement of moral judgment! If one is to compel himself to call that *white* which his native moral sense emphatically declares to be *black*, then farewell to moral clearness and health!

his great mind have often prevented these from being duly considered. Nevertheless, his works remain a source both of valuable instruction and healthful inspiration for every serious reader.

As a Christian, Augustine commands interest, as being one of that class who could refer to an experience positive, profound, and transforming. He was born about 353, at the village of Tagaste in Numidia. His father was an adherent of the heathen religion until near his death; his mother, Monica, was a devoted Christian, whose prayers for the salvation of her son were ever fresh upon the divine altar until she obtained the pledge of their acceptance. For many years there was little token of a gracious response. Augustine appeared absorbed in the study and practice of the rhetorician's art, or, still worse, bound by the chain of illicit pleasures. "I was," he said, in subsequent utterances of self-condemnation, "far from Thy face through my darkened affections. I was become deaf by the rattling of the chains of my mortality. . . . Behold with what companions I walked the streets of Babylon, in whose filth I was rolled as if in cinnamon and precious ointments. . . . I befouled the spring of friendship with the filth of concupiscence, and dimmed its lustre with the hell of lustfulness; and yet, foul and dishonorable as I was, I craved, through an excess of vanity, to be thought elegant and urbane."[1] Very likely, in these strong accusations against his former life, Augustine acted as an unsparing critic, and judged his course from the stand-point of the most sensitive conscience; but we know from his own explicit statement, that the part-

[1] Confessions.

ner with whom he lived for years, and by whom he had a son, was not his by lawful wedlock. The age of manhood came to Augustine without definite indications of religious awakening, except of an abnormal and fruitless kind. From his nineteenth to his twenty-eighth year he adhered to the sect of the Manichæans, not passing, however, beyond the rank of a hearer. "Nearly nine years passed," he says, "in which I wallowed in the slime of that deep pit and the darkness of falsehood, striving often to rise, but being all the more heavily dashed down."

Meanwhile, the power of a mother's prayers, and the cravings of a nature robbed of its proper food, were drawing him toward the true spiritual goal. An inner discontent proved the truthfulness of the maxim which he afterwards placed upon the opening page of his Confessions: "Thou hast formed us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee." As he came to Milan, as teacher of rhetoric, a deeper feeling than mere discontent finally took hold of his heart. The agony of poignant conviction was felt. "Thou didst set me," he writes, "face to face with myself, that I might behold how foul I was, and how crooked and sordid, bespotted and ulcerous. And I beheld, and loathed myself." While thus cast down with a sense of personal degradation and longing for deliverance, the voice of a child, which seemed to come from a neighboring house, directed him to the Scriptures. He opened and read, "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof." No sooner was the sentence finished, than "all the gloom of doubt vanished away." Augustine

was now a new man. The chains of sinful delights had been snapped asunder. "How sweet," he exclaims, "did it suddenly become to me to be without the delights of trifles! And what at one time I feared to lose, it was now a joy to me to put away. For Thou didst cast them away from me, Thou true and highest sweetness, and instead of them didst enter in Thyself, — sweeter than all pleasure, brighter than all light. . . . He loves Thee too little who loves aught with Thee, which he loves not for Thee, O love, who ever burnest, and art never quenched!" A joy in God rising to the verge of ecstasy, but at the same time chastened by a feeling of personal unworthiness, was henceforth a principal factor in the inner life of the son of Monica.

Augustine was converted in 386. In 395 he became bishop of the Numidian city Hippo, a position retained till his death, in 430. He died as the shadow of the invasion by the Vandals was upon his country. But we may well believe that his faith rose above the outward shadow, and that his departure was lighted by visions of that supernal beauty, toward which his desire had ardently reached, as his own words testify: "O, how wonderful, how beautiful and lovely are the dwellings of Thy house, Almighty God! I burn with longing to behold Thy beauty in Thy bridal chamber."

CHAPTER VI.

PRODUCTS OF THE ARTISTIC SPIRIT IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

I. — Hymns and Liturgies.

1. Introductory. — Among the outgrowths of the Christian religion the hymn occupies a place of unique interest and significance. Combining in its idea both music and poetry, it is the congenial medium for expressing the emotional and æsthetic elements which enter into all deep religious experience. It at once satisfies and reveals inward piety. While it has the worth which pertains to artistic products in general, it serves at the same time to mirror the mind from which it issued, and is often an index of the age in which it received its birth. Speaking of the hymns of the early Church, Dorner says: "As in the Psalms of the Old Testament we have the most instructive monuments of ancient Hebrew piety, and thereby ascertain what passed over from the ancient revelation into joy and life, what filled the heart and burst forth from it in song, so may we regard the old Christian hymnology."[1]

The interpreter, it is true, must take due account of the truth that the highest piety of one Christian age

[1] History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.

in its more essential phases is very closely akin to the highest piety of any other Christian age. He may expect, therefore, to find the nobler hymns of different eras exhibiting something of a family likeness. He may properly take it as a sign of great dearth, either in poetic talent or in religious life, where such traits as lowly reverence before the majesty of God, deep repentance in view of sin, intense joy and gratitude over the amazing facts of redemption, have not received illustration in at least a few worthy specimens of sacred song. Nevertheless, taken in a body the hymns of an age bear its seal and superscription. They show the type of Christian civilization from which they emanated. Greek, mediæval Latin, and Protestant hymnology have each distinguishing characteristics. Greater rhetorical luxuriance belongs on the whole to the first than to the second. Both mix with their pure gold the alloy of saint-worship. Both do less justice to the interior life than does the Protestant hymnology, are less rich in hymns which fitly celebrate the divine indwelling, the transforming power of grace, the agony and unrest of conscious guilt, the rapture of communion with God.

2. Greek Hymns. — It seems probable that such Greek hymns as came into use in the apostolic age, and the time immediately following, were in measured prose.[1] Further on there was an attempt to utilize the measures of the classical poets. Gregory Nazianzen, the first of the Greek fathers to win poetical distinction, used these measures. Sophronius, who wrote in the seventh century, selected among classical models

[1] J. M. Neale, Hymns of the Eastern Church.

Anacreontics, — a somewhat surprising choice for the serious themes of the Christian religion. In general, this borrowing was not successful. The Greek language was no longer the Greek of the classic era. Many new terms had been brought in to meet the new conditions. To follow the classic measures involved too great a bondage. It was necessary, therefore, to strike out a new path, or else to return toward the most primitive model of the Christian hymn. The latter alternative was the one adopted. The expedient of rhyme to which the Latins resorted was not introduced into the Greek hymns. After the beginning of the eighth century, verse proper was for the most part discarded in the Eastern Church, and the hymns were written in measured prose. The *troparia*, as the stanzas were called, were divided for chanting by commas disposed irrespective of the sense. The following may serve as an example. "Israel in ancient times passing on foot with, unbedewed steps the Red Gulf, of the sea, turned to flight by, the cross-typefying arms, of Moses the might of Amelek, in the wilderness." The initial stanza which supplied the model was called the *hirmos*. A number of *troparia* (from three to upwards of twenty) constituted an *ode*, and the complete Greek hymn or *canon* was understood to contain nine odes. In reality, however, eight odes made a canon.[1]

[1] Neale says: The reason for the number nine is this: that there are nine Scriptural canticles employed at Lauds, on the model of which those in every canon are formed. The first, that of Moses after the passage of the Red Sea; the second, that of Moses in Deuteronomy (xxxiii.); the third, that of Hannah; the fourth, that of Habakkuk; the fifth, that of Isaiah (xxvi. 9–20); the sixth, that of Jonah; the

According to Neale, who has rendered excellent service in illustrating the characteristics of the eastern hymns and making some of the best of them available in the worship of the west, three eras are distinctly marked in the history of Greek hymnology: (1) "That of *formation*, while it was gradually throwing off the bondage of classical metres and inventing and perfecting its various styles. This ends about A. D. 726. (2) That of perfection, which nearly coincides with the period of the iconoclastic controversy, A. D. 726–820. (3) That of *decadence*, A. D. 820–1400, when the effeteness of an effeminate court and the dissolution of a decaying empire reduced ecclesiastical poetry by slow degrees to a stilted bombast, giving to great words little meaning, tricking out commonplaces in diction more and more gorgeous, till sense and simplicity are alike sought in vain."

The marked decline in the third of these eras is manifest in the choice of themes as well as in lack of taste and inspiration in their treatment. While a large proportion of the earlier productions were on themes of universal interest, — the great topics of the gospel, — a multitude of the later ones were in commemoration of martyrs from whose utter obscurity scarcely more than their names and the fact of their suffering have been preserved. This dearth in respect of quality, however, was far from being accompanied by an equal dearth in

seventh, that of the Three Children; the eighth, *Benedicite*; the ninth, *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*. From this arrangement two consequences follow. The first, that as the second canticle is never recited except at Lent, the canons never have any second ode. The second, that there is generally some reference, either direct or indirect, in each ode to the canticle of the same number.

respect of quantity. In the collection of Greek hymns, which is very extensive, — greatly in excess of the Latin, — the largest part was contributed by the dullest era.

From this general review of the subject we may fitly proceed to notice some of the details of Greek hymnology. Referring for more extended information to such works as Daniel's "Thesaurus Hymnologicus," we will mention only a few of the more important facts.

We have clear intimations that the Greek Church produced a number of original hymns within the first three centuries.[1] The extent, however, to which these were employed in the public services stands in question. Some of them were ill-suited to the uses of the sanctuary. Moreover, the example of heretics probably caused a measure of doubt with respect to their appropriation and inclined Catholic pastors to a preference for the Biblical hymns.[2]

Among the very few extant specimens of the early hymnology none is probably older than that which is attributed to Clement of Alexandria. It is little else than a chain of epithets descriptive of the offices of Christ. The following is a literal translation of the first part: —

[1] Euseb., Hist. Eccl. v. 28; Tertul., Ad Uxor. ii. 8; Origen, Cont. Cel. viii. 67.

[2] Const. Apost. ii. 57, speaks of chanting the Psalms of David. The Council of Laodicea (can. 59) prohibited the ecclesiastical use of "private hymns." Schaff understands by these terms all extra-biblical hymns. Hefele, on the other hand, seems to favor the conclusion that the prohibition extended only to hymns which had not received the approval of the Church authorities.

Bridle of untamed colts,
Wing of unwandering birds,
Sure helm of babes,
Shepherd of royal lambs!
Assemble Thy simple children
To praise holily,
To hymn guilelessly
With innocent mouths
Christ, the guide of children.

O king of saints,
All-subduing Word
Of the most high Father,
Prince of wisdom,
Support of sorrows,
That rejoicest in the ages,
Jesus, Saviour
Of the human race,
Shepherd, Husbandman,
Helm, Bridle,
Heavenly Wing,
Of the all holy flock,
Fisher of men
Who are saved,
Catching the chaste fishes,
With sweet life
From the hateful wave
Of a sea of vices.

Lying much nearer to the requirements of the sanctuary than the hymn of Clement, and destined to a much wider reception, was the morning hymn, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, in which the advent song of the angels is supplemented by suitable expressions of praise and prayer. Its origin was as early as the third century, perhaps still earlier. The English form of it

being so well known, it is most fitly presented here in the original.[1]

ΎΜΝΟΣ ΈΩΘΙΝΌΣ.

Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ,
Καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη,
Ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία.
Αἰνοῦμέν σε,
Εὐλογοῦμέν σε,
Προσκυνοῦμέν σε,
Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι
Διὰ τὴν μεγάλην σου δόξαν.
Κύριε βασιλεῦ ἐπουράνιε,
Θεὸς πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ,
Κύριε υἱὲ μονογενὲς
Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ,
Καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα,
Κύριε ὁ θεός.
Ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ,
Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς,
Ὁ αἴρων τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου,
Προσδέξαι τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν.
Ὁ καθήμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς,
Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς,
Ὅτι σὺ εἶ μόνος ἅγιος,
Σὺ εἶ μόνος κύριος,
Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς,
Εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός. Ἀμήν.

The less celebrated evening hymn is as follows: —

ΎΜΝΟΣ ΈΣΠΕΡΙΝΌΣ.

Φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης,
Ἀθανάτου πατρὸς οὐρανίου,
Ἁγίου, μάκαρος,
Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ,
Ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλίου δύσιν,
Ἰδόντες φῶς ἑσπερινὸν,

[1] Found in the Thesaurus of Daniel. Compare Const. Apost vii 47

Ὑμνοῦμεν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν
Καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα θεόν.
Ἄξιόν σε ἐν πᾶσι
Καιροῖς, ὑμνεῖσθαι φωναῖς
Ὁσίαις, υἱὲ θεοῦ,
Ζωὴν ὁ διδοὺς, διὸ
Ὁ κόσμος σε δοξάζει.[1]

The Greek original on which the *Te Deum* was based is also to be reckoned among early hymns.

The religious poems of Gregory Nazianzen were not well adapted for use in public worship, and seem not to have been employed for that purpose. Those of his contemporary Ephraem were utilized in the Syrian Church as a means of indoctrination in the Catholic faith.

Before the middle era of genuine poetic inspiration, Anatolius, who wrote in the fifth century, was the brightest name in the list of Greek hymnists. A very pleasing simplicity and vivacity characterize his brief productions. One of them, charmingly adapted to the common people, has been much used as an evening hymn in the Greek Isles. The first stanza will serve to indicate its tone: —

[1] The following translation preserves very fairly the sense of the original: —

"Hail! cheerful Light, of His pure glory poured,
Who is th' Immortal Father, Heavenly, Blest,
Holiest of Holies, — Jesus Christ our Lord!
Now are we come to the sun's hour of rest,
The lights of evening round us shine,
We sing the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost Divine!
Worthiest art Thou at all times, to be sung
With undefilèd tongue,
Son of our God, Giver of Life, alone!
Therefore, in all the world, Thy glories, Lord, we own."

The day is past and over;
All thanks, O Lord, to Thee!
I pray Thee now that sinless
The hours of dark may be.
O Jesu! keep me in Thy sight,
And save me through the coming night![1]

The following advent hymn of Anatolius will not be found unworthy of quotation:—

A great and mighty wonder,
The festal makes secure;
The Virgin bears the Infant
With Virgin honor pure.

The Word is made incarnate,
And yet remains on high;
And cherubim sing anthems
To shepherds from the sky.

And we with them triumphant
Repeat the hymn again;
"To God on high be glory,
And peace on earth to men!"

While thus they sing your monarch,
Those bright angelic bands,
Rejoice, ye vales and mountains!
Ye oceans, clap your hands!

Since all He comes to ransom,
By all be He adored,
The Infant born in Bethlehem,
The Saviour and the Lord!

Now idol forms shall perish,
All error shall decay,
And Christ shall wield His sceptre,
Our Lord and God for aye.

[1] This and the following selections from the Greek hymns are given in Neale's version.

His hymn on the stilling of the wind and the waves gives a graphic reproduction of the gospel scene: —

Fierce was the wild billow,
  Dark was the night;
Oars labored heavily,
  Foam glimmer'd white;
Mariners trembled,
  Peril was nigh;
Then said the God of God,
  "Peace! It is I."

Ridge of the mountain-wave,
  Lower thy crest!
Wail of Euroclydon,
  Be thou at rest!
Peril can none be,
  Sorrow must fly,
Where saith the Light of Light,
  "Peace! It is I."

Jesu, Deliverer,
  Come Thou to me!
Soothe Thou my voyaging
  Over life's sea,
Thou, when the storm of death
  Roars sweeping by,
Whisper, O Truth of Truth,
  "Peace! It is I."

3. Latin Hymns. — In the Latin Church the attempt to utilize the classic verse was scarcely more successful than the parallel attempt in the Greek Church. Hence the first development naturally consisted in a gradual breaking away from the old Latin system of versification. The shackles of quantity were in time unloosed,

and accent and rhyme were made the grand elements in sacred verse. This period of the decomposition of old forms and of the preparation for new may be regarded as ending with Gregory the Great.

The above development is thus described by Neale:

"Ecclesiastical Latin Poetry has a language of its own no more to be compared with, or judged by, the dialect of Virgil or Horace than Ariosto or Camoens can be. It has rules, — subtle, elaborate rules of its own; it has a grammar of its own; its ornaments are original; its diction unborrowed. And we may venture fearlessly to say that in strength and freshness it surpasses the Latin poetry of a more classical age, poetry, whose inspiration, form, metre, and ornaments were essentially Greek. But in like manner as the Spanish, French, Portuguese and Italian languages, before they attained to their present status, did necessarily pass through a stage of barbarism in their formation from the old Latin, so it was with mediæval poetry. . . . It could not at once reject the shackles of metre; it could not at once arrange its own accentual laws, and it took centuries in developing the full power of the new element that it introduced, namely rhyme. . . . The church threw herself on the original genius of the Latin language, on the universal recognition of accent, in preference to the arbitrary restrictions of quantity. Her hymns were intended to be sung, and this again developed the musical power of sound, and hence principally rhyme; and thus a new language sprung up under her hands."[1]

In judging of the Latin hymns due account must be taken not only of their content and their form, but also of their musical associations and adaptations. These are very important elements in their effect.

[1] Ecclesiastical Latin Poetry of the Middle Ages.

"As a whole," says Milman, "the hymnology of the Latin Church has a singularly solemn and majestic tone. Much of it, no doubt, like the lyric verse of the Greeks, was twin-born with the music; its cadence is musical rather than metrical. It suggests, as it were, the grave full tones of the chant, the sustained grandeur, the glorious burst, the tender fall, the mysterious dying away of the organ. It must be heard, not read. Decompose it into its elements, coldly examine its thoughts, its images, its words, its versification, and its magic is gone. Listen to it, or even read it with the imagination or the memory full of the accompanying chant; it has an indescribable sympathy with the religious emotions even of those of whose daily service it does not constitute a part." [1]

Though not the first to express Christian truths in verse, Hilary of Poitiers may be regarded as the earliest hymnist of the Latin Church. The specimens of sacred poetry which had been given forth by preceding writers were not designed for the church services. Hilary used the Iambic dimeter, which indeed was the prevailing type till the latter part of the sixth century.[2] Some of the hymns ascribed to Hilary are of doubtful authorship. The following is one with which he is generally credited: —

Lucis largitor splendide,
Cujus sereno lumine
Post lapsa noctis tempora
Dies refusus panditur:

[1] Latin Christianity, Book xiv. Chap. iv.

[2] The principal kinds of verse found in the Latin hymns have been enumerated as follows: (1) Iambic dimetri, (2) Iambic trimetri, (3) Trochaic dimetri, (4) Sapphici cum Adonico in fine, (5) Trochaici, (6) Asclepiadici cum Glyconico in fine.

Tu verus mundi Lucifer,
Non is, qui parvi sideris
Venturae lucis nuntius
Angusto fulget lumine,

Sed toto sole clarior,
Lux ipse totus et dies,
Interna nostri pectoris
Illuminans praecordia.[1]

Damasus, who became Bishop of Rome near the time of Hilary's death, is credited with a considerable list of poems, two of which, in honor of the Apostle Andrew and the martyr Agatha respectively, are of a lyrical cast. If it be concluded that Damasus was certainly the author of the hymn to Saint Agatha, he has the distinction of having anticipated the adoption of rhyme in the Latin Church poetry.

The double service rendered by Ambrose of Milan, in improving the music of the church and enriching the collection of hymns, has assigned him an illustrious place in the records of Latin hymnology. Augustine

[1] O glorious Father of the light,
From whose effulgence calm and bright,
Soon as the hours of night are fled,
The brilliance of the dawn is shed;

Thou art the dark world's truer ray.
No radiance of that lesser day,
That heralds, in the morn begun,
The advent of our darker sun;

But brighter than its noontide gleam,
Thyself full daylight's fullest beam,
The inmost mansions of our breast
Thou by thy grace illuminest.

in his "Confessions" has given testimony to the deep impression made upon himself by the music of the Milan Church. "How greatly did I weep in Thy hymns and canticles, deeply moved by the voices of Thy sweetly-attuned Church! The voices flowed into mine ears, and the truth was poured into my heart, whence the agitation of my piety overflowed, and my tears ran over, and blessed was I therein." [1]

A great simplicity, one might almost say plainness and ruggedness, characterizes the effusions of Ambrose. This feature, however, impairs rather the first impression than the final estimate.

"It is some little while," says Trench, "before one returns [from the softer and richer strains of some of the later poets] with a hearty consent and liking to the almost austere simplicity which characterizes the hymns of Ambrose. It is felt as though there were a certain coldness in them, an *aloofness* of the author from his subject, a refusal to blend and fuse himself with it. The absence too of rhyme — for which the almost uniform use of a metre very far from the richest among the Latin lyric forms, and with singularly few resources for producing variety of pause or cadence, seems a very insufficient compensation — adds to this feeling of disappointment. The ear and the heart seem alike to be without their due satisfaction. Only after a while does one learn to feel the grandeur of this unadorned metre, and the profound, though it may have been more instinctive than conscious, wisdom of the poet in choosing it; or to appreciate that confidence in the surpassing interest of his theme, which

[1] Confess. ix. 6. In the same connection Augustine adds this statement: "At this time it was instituted that after the manner of the Eastern Church hymns and psalms should be sung, lest the people should pine away in the tediousness of sorrow."

has rendered him indifferent to any but its simplest setting forth. It is as though building an altar to the living God he would observe the levitical precept and rear it of unhewn stones, upon which no tool had been lifted. The great objects of faith in their simplest expression are felt by him so sufficient to stir all the deepest affections of the heart that any attempt to dress them up, to array them in moving language, were simply superfluous. The passion is there, but it is latent and repressed, a fire burning inwardly, the glow of an austere enthusiasm, which reveals itself indeed, but not to every careless beholder." [1]

Neale accounts as genuine ten of the many hymns assigned to Ambrose. The following on the Nativity is one of the most celebrated. We give the opening and the last three stanzas: —

Veni, Redemptor gentium,[2]
Ostende partum Virginis;
Miretur omne saeculum:
Talis decet partus Deum.

Egressus ejus a Patre,
Regressus ejus ad Patrem,
Excursus usque ad inferos,
Recursus ad sedem Dei.

[1] R. C. Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry.

[2] Come, Thou Redeemer of the earth,
Come, testify Thy Virgin Birth:
All lands admire, all times applaud:
Such is the birth that fits a God.

From God the Father He proceeds,
To God the Father back He speeds:
Proceeds — as far as very hell:
Speeds back to light ineffable.

O equal to the Father, Thou!
Gird on Thy fleshly trophy now,
The weakness of our mortal state
With deathless might invigorate.

Thy cradle here shall glitter bright,
And darkness breathe a newer light,
Where endless faith shall shine serene,
And twilight never intervene.

Aequalis aeterno Patri,
Carnis tropaeo accingere,
Infirma nostri corporis
Virtute firmans perpetim.

Praesepe jam fulget tuum
Lumenque nox spirat novum,
Quod nulla nox interpolet
Fideque jugi luceat.

As the Te Deum is sometimes accredited to Ambrose we may fitly, in this connection, subjoin a portion of its text: —

Te deum laudamus,
te dominum confitemur,
te aeternum Patrem
omnis terra veneratur.

Tibi omnes angeli, tibi caeli
et universae potestates,
tibi cherubim et seraphim
incessabili voce proclamant:

Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus
Dominus Deus Sabaoth!
pleni sunt caeli et terra
majestate gloriae tuae.

Te gloriosus apostolorum chorus,
te prophetarum laudabilis numerus,
te martyrum candidatus
laudat exercitus.

Te per orbem terrarum
sancta confitetur ecclesia,
Patrem immensae majestatis,
venerandum tuum verum unicum filium,
sanctum quoque paracletum spiritum.

In the latter part of the fourth century and the first half of the fifth we have the names of Prudentius and Sedulius, — the former a Spaniard, the latter a native of Scotland or Ireland. Prudentius was a very prodigal versifier. Milman complains that "he is insufferably long, and suffocates all which is noble or touching with his fatal copiousness." He shows, however, a very clever faculty in the management of his verse, and many noble sentiments find an agreeable expression in his poems. As respects ability to command a popular appreciation few of his productions have excelled the burial hymn beginning with these lines: —

Jam moesta quiesce querela,[1]
Lacrimas suspendite, matres,
Nullus sua pignora plangat,
Mors haec reparatio vitae est.

Among the productions of Sedulius we have an acrostic hymn, which gives in as many stanzas as there are letters in the alphabet an outline of the whole life of Christ.

A solis ortus cardine
Ad usque terrae limitem
Christum canamus principem,
Natum Maria virgine.

Beatus auctor saeculi
Servile corpus induit,
Ut carne carnem liberans
Ne perderet quod condidit.

[1] No more, ah, no more sad complaining;
Resign these fond pledges to earth.
Stay, mothers, the thick-falling tear-drops;
This death is a heavenly birth.

4. LITURGIES.[1] — In its earlier Christian use the word "Liturgy" (λειτουργία) was applied to any sacred service. Ere long the term acquired a restricted sense, and was used pre-eminently to denote the forms which entered into the celebration of the Eucharist.

The liturgical development doubtless proceeded by gradual accretion from simple beginnings. The first three centuries contributed, very likely, a kind of liturgical tradition, or general custom respecting the principal factors and stages in the ceremonial. Some portions of the prayers also may have acquired a currency which caused them to be repeated substantially verbatim in later formularies. As early a writing as Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians contained, in its closing chapters, liturgical phrases which reappeared in the worship of later centuries. But there is little evidence that any considerable number of exact forms were inherited from the first three centuries. Even in the early part of the fifth century, as was learned from the historian Socrates, great liberty was used by individual churches in ordering their worship. Suggestions and general features were the principal contributions which the compilers of liturgies in the fourth and fifth centuries received from the preceding period.

[1] See J. M. Neale, "The Liturgies of Saint Mark, Saint James, Saint Clement, Saint Chrysostom, Saint Basil;" H. A. Daniel, "Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Universae;" William Palmer, "Origines Liturgicae;" Samuel Cheetham, Article in the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, by Smith and Cheetham; Philip Schaff, "Church History," Vol. III.; C. W. Bennett, "Christian Archæology;" E. F. K. Fortescue, "The Armenian Church: Its History, Liturgy, Doctrine, and Ceremonies;" A. J. Butler, "The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt;" F. E. Warren, "The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church."

The earliest of the extant liturgies bears the name of Saint Clement, and has been handed down in the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions. The probable date of its composition was the early part of the fourth century. Among the marks of its early origin are the absence of all trace of mariolatry, and the commemoration of the saints only in a general way, as opposed to the mention of individuals. In a less degree the strict separation which appears between the catechumens and the general body of believers is also a sign of early origin. An exceptional feature is the omission of the Lord's Prayer. There is no certain indication that this liturgy was ever in actual use.

The liturgy of Saint Clement belongs with the Oriental group. This group is very large, embracing several families with subordinate divisions. Neale gives the families as follows: "(1) That of Saint James, or Jerusalem; (2) That of Saint Mark, or Alexandria; (3) That of Saint Thaddeus, or the East; (4) That of Saint John, or Ephesus."

The most distinguished members of the Jerusalem family are, besides the liturgy of Saint James, which served as the norm, that of Saint Basil, that of Saint Chrysostom, and the Armenian. A special interest pertains to the liturgy of Saint Chrysostom because of its continued and extensive use. It is still read in the orthodox Greek and Russian Churches, except at certain special seasons, when that of Saint Basil is used. The connection with the illustrious bishop whose name it bears is not considered very thoroughly established.

The principal liturgies of the Alexandrine family, affiliating with the liturgy of Saint Mark, are those of Saint Cyril, Saint Gregory, and Saint Basil. The last of these, it should be noticed, is quite distinct from the liturgy of the same name in the preceding family. In the family of Saint Thaddeus are contained several Nestorian liturgies.

The Ephesine family was represented on western soil by the Old Spanish, or Mozarabic, and the Old Gallican. With the latter is associated the Old British liturgy.

The Roman liturgy, which supplanted the three just mentioned, stands (with the long obsolete liturgy of North Africa) for the proper Latin type. It was of gradual formation and cannot be traced satisfactorily beyond the middle of the fifth century. With the ascendency of the Roman bishop it was naturally introduced throughout the West. Milan, however, has continued even to the present in the enjoyment of her own liturgy, the Ambrosian, which is distinguished from the Roman by some Oriental features. The province of Acquileia had also, for a long time, a distinct liturgy.

Western custom bore a token of the centralized authority of Rome in that the language of the imperial city was made the one vehicle of the sacred offices. The East, on the other hand, embodied its liturgies in various vernaculars. There is also a tinge of dogmatic difference between the formularies of the two regions. The Eastern pays more attention to the general course of revelation. Moreover somewhat of the Greek predilection for the Christological side of theology, or

the doctrine of the incarnation of the Divine Word, is apparent in the Eastern liturgies, whereas in the Roman the main stress is placed upon the sacrificial offering of Christ. A specific distinction as to contents is seen in the omission in the Roman liturgy of that express invocation of the Holy Spirit for the sanctification of the elements, which is contained in the Eastern liturgies. The Roman liturgy has also varying collects and prefaces for different occasions, while in the Eastern generally the collects are wanting and the prefaces are uniform.

The principal subdivisions of the Oriental liturgy are thus indicated by Neale: —

"Every liturgy may be divided into two parts; the Pro-Anaphoral, and the Anaphoral portion. The former extends to the *sursum corda;* the latter from there to the end. The Pro-Anaphoral portion is divided into the Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful. The Anaphoral portion has these four divisions: The great eucharistic prayer; the consecration; the intercession for quick and dead; and the communion." [1]

The composition of a worthy liturgy, it is obvious, calls for the highest artistic faculty as well as for the deepest devotion. Only the most thorough religious and literary taste can ascend to that union of simplicity

[1] This account, it will be observed, does not include the *preparatory prayers.* Speaking of the Armenian liturgy, Fortescue says: "Like all Oriental liturgies, it may be divided into three parts: (1) The preparatory prayers, which in this rite are partly said in the vestry and partly in the church by the priest; (2) the introduction; (3) the liturgy itself. In the two latter, which are technically called the Pro-Anaphora and Anaphora, the people join also."

and majesty which makes the crowning excellence in forms of public worship. Various passages in these early liturgies exhibit this needful combination. They must accordingly be ever valued as models, though it is but a blind worship of antiquity which prohibits the hope that taste and devotion may still produce equally fitting and beautiful forms of religious expression.

As illustrating the requisites of liturgical excellence, the prayer of oblation from the liturgy of Saint Chrysostom may be cited: —

"Lord, God Almighty, Only Holy, Who receivest the sacrifice of praise from them that call upon Thee with their whole heart, receive also the supplication of us sinners, and cause it to approach to Thy holy altar, and enable us to present gifts to Thee, and spiritual sacrifices for our sins, and for the errors of the people: and cause us to find grace in Thy sight, that this our sacrifice may be acceptable unto Thee, and that the good Spirit of Thy grace may tabernacle upon us, and upon these gifts presented unto Thee, and upon all Thy people."

The following from the liturgy of Saint Mark is not so near the ideal of simplicity, but is nevertheless very beautiful: —

"God of light, Father of life, Author of grace, Framer of the worlds, Founder of knowledge, Giver of wisdom, Treasure of holiness, Teacher of pure prayers, Benefactor of the soul, Who givest to the weak-hearted who trust in Thee those things into which the angels desire to look: Who hast raised us from the abyss to light, hast given us life from death, hast granted us freedom from slavery, hast dissolved

in us the darkness of sin by the coming of Thine Only-Begotten Son; now also, O Lord, illuminate the eyes of our understanding by the visitation of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may without condemnation partake of this immortal and heavenly food; and sanctify us wholly, soul, body, and spirit, that with Thy holy disciples and apostles we may say to Thee this prayer, Our Father. . . . And make us worthy, O Lord and Lover of men, with boldness, without condemnation, with a pure heart, with an enlightened soul, with a countenance that needeth not to be ashamed, with hallowed lips, to dare to call upon Thee our holy God and Father, Which art in heaven." [1]

Alongside the elaboration of liturgical forms proceeded the enrichment of liturgical vestments. The white garments which constituted the sacerdotal garb for several centuries were gradually supplemented, until place was given to the five ecclesiastical colors. "In every-day life, for the first five or six centuries, the clergy universally wore the ordinary citizens' dress; then gradually, after the precedent of Jewish priests and Christian monks, exchanged it for a suitable official costume, to make manifest their elevation above the laity." [2]

II. — Architecture.

Religion has always been the patron of architecture. Wherever civilized skill has been found it has been present to claim the noblest employment of the high gift for its own purposes. The heathen nations

[1] Neale's translation.
[2] Schaff, Church History, Vol. III.

have felt its mighty and creative impulse. Imbued with the feeling that they should build more grandly for their gods than for themselves, they have made the most lavish expenditures upon sacred edifices.

Christianity, with her powerful sway over the minds and hearts of men, was naturally quite the equal of preceding systems in subsidizing skill and treasure for religious buildings. No sooner were the needful resources at her command than she began to employ them with Solomonic munificence. A large proportion of the wealth of society flowed to the sanctuary. Europe had scarcely been evangelized before it was dotted with costly and stately structures. A town might be destitute of every other token of elegance, its inhabitants might be compelled to live in wooden buildings of the most humble description; but it was almost certain to have its church built of stone, generously adorned, and towering in grandeur far above all surrounding structures.

In the history of Christian architecture, we may note several eras, or the successive appearance of several different types, each of which has been dominant for a time. It should be understood, however, that in no case have the earlier styles been wholly displaced by the later. Different types have co-existed, and in many cases have worked upon and modified each other. Still there are lines of demarkation which may be traced with sufficient definiteness. Most writers, while perhaps they indulge some difference in terminology, distinguish five styles as successively appearing before the Reformation. In a not unusual classification these are specified as fol-

lows: the Basilica, the Byzantine, the Romanesque, the Gothic, and the Renaissance.[1]

For about two centuries the Christians probably accomplished very little in the way of church building. The private dwelling oftentimes served as the sanctuary. For regular houses of worship there was no adequate security during the era of persecutions. Still the Christians by no means waited for heathen fury to deal its final blows before providing themselves with edifices devoted specially to religious services. Whatever may have been the number of such edifices at an earlier date, it is certain that many were built in the last half of the third century.

The opinion has been very generally entertained that the Roman basilica, or hall of justice, was the model which the Christians followed in their early architectural efforts; but recently opposing theories have been broached. Reference has been made to the influence of the Jewish synagogue. Some writers have contended that the banqueting hall of the private dwelling, which among the wealthy was spacious and elegant, afforded the main features of the plan adopted. Some have regarded the *schola*, or hall of a fraternity, used mainly if not exclusively for funeral rites, as the most effective model in the first stages of Christian architecture. Such elements as these in the building art of the time were doubtless objects of continued observation. There is no good reason, therefore, why any one of them may not be supposed to have exerted a measure of in-

[1] Fergusson uses a different terminology, giving the name of Romanesque to the first style, and calling the third Early or Round-arch Gothic. Lord Lindsay describes the third under the title Lombard style.

fluence.[1] Still, it is proper to consider the basilica a very influential factor, as being the most conspicuous example at hand of a spacious columned hall. It was an oblong building with a gallery on either side supported by a row of columns. The galleries were roofed over. The middle space in some instances was open to the sky, but in others it was roofed. In the latter case it readily supplied the plan of a building suited to the uses of a Christian assembly.

On appropriating the basilican type the Christians divided and arranged the interior space according to the demands of their liturgical and ecclesiastical system. The apse and the adjoining portion were separated from the rest of the church and raised somewhat above the general level. This section, which was the place of ecclesiastics, was called the sanctuarium or presbyterium. The raised seat of the bishop was at the centre of the apse; the higher clergy were ranged on either side near the wall. The altar was placed to the front of the apse. Originally it was uncovered, but afterwards was surmounted by a tabernacle resting on pillars, the so-called *ciborium*. The lower clergy, who took part in the choir-singing, occupied a space which was railed off in the body of the house in front of the

[1] Prof. C. W. Bennett, after a careful survey of the subject, fixes upon an eclectic theory in these terms: "The ordinary private dwelling-house, the triclinia of the more elegant houses of the nobler families that had embraced Christianity, the lodge-rooms, the cellæ of the burial chapels, and the imposing interior arrangement of colonnades in the heathen law-basilicas, are the sources whence are derived the germs which under the fostering and inspiring spirit of the new religion during periods of toleration and peace were developed into a distinctively Christian architecture whose chief characteristics continued for a thousand years." (*Christian Archæology*, pp. 183, 184.)

presbyterium. On either side of this space, which from its occupants took the name of the "choir," was a pulpit. From the one on the left (or north) the Gospel was read; from the one on the right, the Epistle. In time, however, the choir was located within the presbyterium, and the pulpits were attached to the barrier which separated the presbyterium from the rest of the building. The juncture of the transept with the nave was often made by a large arch called the triumphal arch. Underneath the presbyterium, sometimes partly below the level of the earth, was the crypt, in which the relics of the saints were deposited.

The nave, or central aisle, which was carried considerably higher than the side aisles, was separated from the latter by rows of columns usually surmounted by round arches. In a majority of instances there was only one aisle on each side of the nave, but a number of the early churches, as St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and the Lateran, had two aisles on each side.

At the entrance end, which commonly, though not always in the earlier stage, lay to the West, a narrow space, or vestibule, was divided off, called the narthex. This was appointed to the catechumens and to that class of penitents who were permitted to hear the Scripture lessons and the sermon but were dismissed before the celebration of the Eucharist.

In front of the church was usually an atrium or forecourt, having a fountain or laver in the centre at which the worshipper might sprinkle himself, before entering, in token of purification. During the progress of divine service the excommunicate were not expected to approach nearer than this court.

Adjacent to the rectangular basilica as "a ceremonial or sacramental adjunct," there was commonly a round or octagonal edifice, used for baptism and for funereal rites. The former use has given the name to the edifice. It was several centuries before the font was brought into the church proper and the custom of building separate baptisteries was discontinued.

The early Christian basilicas generally presented very plain exteriors. They were without towers; indeed it is not certain that towers were built in connection with churches before the seventh or eighth century, and then for a while they were merely adjacent structures designed to serve as belfries, not integral parts of the church edifice. Interior ornamentation, on the other hand, was far from being neglected. Not to speak of the fine array of columns taken very generally from classic remains, there was in many of the churches a generous display of the precious metals, of mosaic-work, and of fresco. Mosaic was especially abundant, as in this era there was relatively much greater skill in this style of ornamentation than in painting proper. The semi-dome of the apse was sometimes covered with it, and it also found place on the walls of the nave. A device of Byzantine artists in forming a background of gold-leaf under plates of transparent glass provided for it a very brilliant appearance. In delicacy of expression this mosaic-work was doubtless inferior to painting, but a large compensation for this lack was offered in its superior durability. While four centuries or less have seriously dimmed the glory of the great masterpieces of Christian painting, the pictures of the Byzantine artists are said to be as

fresh and brilliant to-day as they were when first executed, more than a thousand years ago.

Ruins of churches in North Africa and Egypt have been discovered which are supposed to antedate the reign of Constantine. Distinguishing characteristics are their small size, the absence of transepts, and in some cases such a construction of the apse that it appears only on the interior. Notwithstanding their limited dimensions some of these churches have five aisles. Remains of churches which were presumably of early date are also found in Syria and Asia Minor.

In the central parts of the empire the oldest churches of which we have historic notice date from the time of Constantine. In both East and West they were of the basilican type. Chief among these was St. Peter's of Rome, built near the circus of Nero in the place where the apostle was reputed to have suffered martyrdom. It was founded by Constantine, and continued, though not without some alterations, till the latter part of the fifteenth century, when the slowly executed design of the present structure was entered upon. Though greatly surpassed by the later edifice in size and magnificence, the original St. Peter's was a noble basilica, rich in ornamentation, and excelling in dimensions most of the later cathedrals, being three hundred and eighty feet long by two hundred and twelve feet in width. The Lateran Church (S. Giovanni in Laterano) was another of the basilicas which Rome owed to the good offices of Constantine. It was fitted up on the site of the Lateran palace which the Emperor donated to the Roman bishop. The building of S. Croce and of S. Pudenziana is also attributed to Constantine. St.

Paul's (S. Paolo fuori le mura), a short distance from the walls of Rome, was built in the closing part of the fourth century. It ranks among the grandest specimens of the early basilica. In some points it excelled the original St. Peter's. Its columns bore a better proportion to the height of the building and its transept had also a more appropriate width, being the same as that of the nave. The interior arrangement as a whole was such as to give a very fine effect. The modern St. Paul's, on the same site, was designed to reproduce the general style of the original one, which was burned in 1823. Among the existing churches of Rome or its neighborhood the S. Clemente is mentioned as specially adapted to furnish a good idea of the primitive basilica. The S. Maria Maggiore, the S. Lorenzo, and the S. Pudenziana subserve a like purpose.

Ravenna almost rivalled Rome as a theatre of early Christian architecture. It still presents an interesting field of study. The five-aisled cathedral, built in the early part of the fifth century, no longer exists; but its baptistery has been preserved together with its original decorations. One finds here also the noble basilicas S. Apollinare in Nuovo and S. Apollinare in Classe, — the former founded by Theodoric, the latter (situated about three miles from the walls) built in the time of Justinian. These churches differed in some respects from the early Roman. They were without transepts and were more consistent and uniform in appearance, inasmuch as the columns with which they were furnished were made to order, instead of being borrowed from classic remains.

In the Byzantine style, which came in as rival to the basilica, the main feature was the dome. This was made the centre toward which the whole structure converged. An oblong form being opposed to the focalizing of the interest in the dome, the ground plan which had been prevalent in the basilica was changed. The square enclosure, or the Greek cross, which with its short and equal arms approximates to a square, was substituted for the oblong form of the Latin cross. About the central dome in many cases were smaller domes.

This style was not altogether a new invention. Before the beginning of Christian architecture the pantheon had already supplied an example of the dome. But in the pantheon the dome rested upon a circular wall, while in the Byzantine churches it rested upon pillars or pillar-masses, — an arrangement adding greatly to the soaring, upreaching aspect of the edifice. To whatever extent, then, it may have been suggested by previous architecture, the Byzantine exhibited a daring advance.

The beginning of this style may be placed in the fifth century. In the sixth century the St. Sophia of Constantinople presented to the world the most admirable specimen of the Byzantine proper. It was built under the patronage of Justinian. The first dedication occurred in 537. Twenty years afterwards an earthquake caused the collapse of a part of the dome. The church, however, was ready for rededication in 563, and from that date has remained unchanged in its leading features. The edifice exclusive of its adjuncts covers an area two hundred and fifty feet long by two hundred and twenty-eight feet broad. The dome has a curva-

ture something less than that of a hemisphere, being one hundred and seven feet across by forty-six feet in height. Forty windows at its base afford abundant light. The summit of the dome is not less than one hundred and seventy feet above the pavement, and full effect is given to this great altitude by the arrangement of the adjacent spaces. "The eye wanders upwards from the large arcades of the ground floor to the smaller arches of the galleries, and thence to the smaller semi-domes. These lead the eye on to the larger, and the whole culminates in the great central roof. Nothing probably so artistic has been done on the same scale before or since."[1]

On the exterior the St. Sophia presented a plain appearance. Some suppose that here the design was left incomplete, it having been the intention of the founder that marble facing and other ornamentation should be added. The interior, on the other hand, was marvellously rich. The altar was a mass of costly stones and precious metals. The pillars were of porphyry, verd antique, or marbles of the finest quality. The walls, the domes, the roofs, were lavishly adorned. The effect of the whole before yet the hand of the Mohammedan victor had defaced any part must have been well-nigh beyond competition.

"When we consider," says Sir Gilbert Scott, "the whole as clothed with the richest beauties of surface, its piers encrusted with inlaid marbles of every hue, its arcades of marble gorgeously carved, its domes and vaultings resplendent with gold mosaic interspersed with solemn figures, and its wide-spreading floors, rich with marble tessellation, over

[1] Fergusson, Pt. II. Bk. ix. Chap. III.

which the buoyant dome floats, self-supported, and seems to sail over you as you move, — I cannot conceive of anything more astonishing, more solemn, and more significant. Well might its imperial founder exclaim, when with pardonable exultation he viewed the result of his costly aspirations, 'Glory to God, who hath thought me worthy to accomplish so great a work. I have vanquished thee, O Solomon!'"[1]

The estimate of Fergusson is not less appreciative.

"Turn it as we will," he says, "and compare it as we may with other buildings of its class, the verdict seems inevitable that Sta. Sophia — internally at least, for we may omit the consideration of the exterior as unfinished — is the most perfect and beautiful church which has yet been erected by any Christian people."

The Byzantine continued to be the model for the Eastern Church.[2] On western soil it also exercised a marked influence as a modifying factor and found besides some specific embodiments. The church of S. Vitale in Ravenna and the chapel of Charlemagne at Aix la Chapelle were of the Byzantine order. St. Mark's in Venice, however, presents the most renowned western specimen of this style. To be sure, St. Mark's in its composite character embraces other elements, but the Byzantine so preponderate that it is most fitly ranked under this name. It was built mainly between 976 and 1071. The foundation plan is the Greek cross, the interior length being two hundred and twenty-eight feet and the breadth two hundred and ten feet. The

[1] Lectures on Mediæval Architecture, Vol. II.

[2] Still it was not followed exclusively in all regions. The Coptic Churches in Egypt present a mixture of the Basilican and the Byzantine types (A. J. Butler, The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt).

roof is surmounted by five domes, one over the centre and one over each arm of the cross. Five hundred columns, in varied styles, enter into the ornamentation, interior and exterior. The mosaics are said to cover an area of more than forty-five thousand square feet, and there is besides a profusion of ornaments in the way of gilding, bronze, and Oriental marble. The result is an appearance of amazing richness. In the view of some critics ornamentation has been carried to the border of the fantastic. Others, however, have not hesitated to pronounce St. Mark's the most perfect piece of color harmony in the world.

III. — Painting.

Painting naturally took a rank altogether superior to that of sculpture in the appreciation and uses of Christianity. Intrinsically the former is better adapted to the representation of Christian ideals than the latter, being at once warmer and richer in the power of expression. Moreover, sculpture had been more thoroughly monopolized by heathen art, and was more strongly associated with idolatry. Scantily used in the Greek Church before the iconoclastic controversy, it suffered proscription in that Church for religious uses after the close of that great strife. In the West the aversion to sculpture was not so marked. Still the art was given but narrow scope; for a long time it was in entire subordination to architecture, and about the only office it was called to fulfil was that of ornamenting the churches. It was first in the fourteenth century that the genius of Nicolo Pisano lifted it to a higher plane

of appreciation. In the next century, fostered by such masters as Donatello, Brunelleschi, Ghiberti, and Michael Angelo, sculpture proved its right to be something more than the handmaid of architecture, and advanced to a position of independent worth. Even then, however, it did not become fairly a rival of painting.

Whatever jealousy may have existed among the early Christians toward art, it was neither universal nor unqualified. There were at least some in the primitive days of Christianity who were ready to exercise their skill in pictorial representations of religious facts and truths, so far as this could be done without directly countenancing idolatrous associations.

The first Christian pictures included little else than symbolism. This was due in part to the feeling that the sacred things of religion ought not to be directly portrayed. But other motives also had weight, especially the desire to avoid unnecessarily provoking heathen scorn and mockery. It may be, too, that the religious mind at a certain stage is naturally attracted by the mystic element in symbolism. The same temper among the early Christians which found so much delight in allegorical interpretations of the Bible would, it may be supposed, spontaneously incline toward allegorical and symbolical forms in its artistic efforts.

Since the catacombs were the chief depositories of early Christian art, in treating of them we have already indicated the symbols which were most frequently employed. Some of these were suggested specifically by the truths of Christianity. Some were borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures, in accordance with the

belief that the events of the old dispensation were typical of the great facts of the new. Some were appropriated from the common fund of symbolism to which the nations generally have been heirs. In individual instances the classic mythology was not eschewed, and scenes having a capital aptitude for the expression of religious truth, like that of Orpheus enchanting the beasts with his music, or of Ulysses encountering the wiles of the Sirens, were utilized for Christian purposes. From whatever source derived these symbolic representations have the same characteristic. Their tone is in general that of a blithe serenity. While they are attachments of the sepulchre, "they are as cheerful as if they had been designed for living households."[1]

The form of Orpheus easily suggested to the Christian mind the office of Christ as the unrivalled charmer of souls. But other ways of representing the Redeemer were much more current. The lamb was a chosen symbol. Very frequently also Christ was represented as a shepherd pasturing His sheep or tenderly bearing upon His shoulder the straying member of the flock. It might be imagined that this form of portrayal was not altogether symbolic. Yet it must be counted such, for while the human form was assigned to Christ there was no pretence of giving His exact features. Indeed, the figure in which He commonly appeared, that of a beardless youth, was obviously designed to be nothing else than an ideal, no real copy of the historical Christ.

Gradually, as the Church became assured of her pos-

[1] Woltmann and Wörmann, History of Painting, English translation.

session of this world, symbolic began to give place to realistic representations. Attempts were made to give the features of Christ, or what might pass for a probable likeness. The earliest of these portrait-like representations are supposed to have appeared near the end of the fourth century. As Augustine indicates, there was no authentic record at this date of Christ's personal appearance.[1] But a specific type became current, and not unnaturally less critical minds were inclined to plead for its historical authority. So we have the story that Christ imprinted His countenance upon a cloth which was presented to Abgarus, king of Edessa, whom Eusebius mentions as having corresponded with the Saviour.[2] A fictitious letter also claimed credence in later times, purporting to be a communication from Publius Lentulus, a pseudo-predecessor of Pilate, to the Roman senate. The letter represents Christ as "a man of lofty stature, of serious and imposing countenance, inspiring love as well as fear in those who behold Him. His hair is the color of wine, straight and without lustre as low as the ears, but thence glossy and curly, flowing upon the shoulders, and divided down the centre of the head. The forehead is smooth and serene, the face without blemish, of a pleasant slightly ruddy color; the expression noble and engaging; nose and mouth of perfect form; the beard abundant and of the same color as the hair; the eyes blue and brilliant."[3]

[1] De Trin., viii. 4. [2] Hist. Eccl. i. 13.

[3] Kugler, History of Painting. — In contrast with the serene majesty which is here portrayed, a representation of Christ as the thorn-crowned man of sorrows had place. This, according to the engaging legend, was impressed upon the veil of Saint Veronica. The veil, having been handed to Christ on His way to crucifixion in order that He might wipe

By the close of the fourth century the custom of surrounding the head of Christ with a nimbus or glory was initiated. This was not an original expedient. Classic art had used it in honor of divinities and also of human dignitaries. As the saints came to be represented with the nimbus, that of Christ was distinguished by drawing upon it the form of the cross.[1]

In style of execution the products of early Christian art show no special divergence from the models of the time. Originality did not extend beyond the subjects portrayed. The better specimens exhibit a fair degree of skill. There was little tendency, however, to improvement; on the contrary, it is commonly conceded that Christian art in the first centuries reflects the deterioration which befell art generally in the Roman Empire, and that consequently we are to look for the best execution in the earlier attempts.

In the fifth century painting proper yielded the field in a considerable measure to mosaic work. This species of decorative art flourished in Italy generally till the ninth century and in Venice to a later date. In the

the sweat from His face, was returned with the sacred image. Aside from these stories, we have the facts that some of the Gnostics in the second century used images of Christ, which they assumed to be authentic likenesses (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., i. 25, 6.); and that Eusebius saw in his day at Caesarea Philippi a bronze image of a kneeling woman and of a man with outstretched hand, which was interpreted to refer to Christ's healing of the woman with the issue of blood (Hist. Eccl. vii. 18.) Such an interpretation rightly provokes question. The image probably had originally as little reference to Christ as the bronze statue in St. Peter's had to the apostle. It is to be noticed, moreover, that Eusebius, in his letter to Constantia, sister of Constantine the Great, decidedly challenged the propriety of attempting to represent the Saviour by any image (Opera, Tom. ii., Epist. ii., Migne.)

[1] Woltmann and Wörmann.

Byzantine Empire, it was cultivated with great zeal and tenacity, being well suited to the half-oriental taste of the eastern region, to which majesty and splendor were of more account than delicacy of delineation. The general type which mosaic work assumed naturally passed over into painting. The term Byzantine, therefore, describes with approximate accuracy the art development of the sixth century and of the three or four centuries immediately following. "The fundamental idea of Byzantine art," says Lübke, "is the utmost development of splendor within the strictly circumscribed limits fixed by the Church." [1] The representatives of this régime worked according to rule. Conventionality usurped the place of the free impulses of genius. Occasionally there was some approach to ideal beauty; but the prevailing cast was that of formality and stiffness. Sainthood was bodied forth by a lean and angular figure robed in court attire.

In the West the Byzantine style was influential from the age of Justinian. However, it did not occupy the whole field. While it supplied the model for the larger and more pretentious works, in the humbler order, such as miniatures, a thoroughly contrasted style sometimes found place, — a style verging upon barbaric rudeness, but yet having the merit of energy and freedom. These features were especially prominent in Lombard and Irish art. The interaction of these contrasted styles served as the ground for a new development. But the consideration of this must be postponed, as we have already passed beyond the bounds of the early Church.

[1] History of Art, vol. I.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

I.

CATHOLIC CREEDS.

1. The Apostles' Creed. — There is ground for the belief that this creed was in use at Rome in the third century, and it may have been in existence before the end of the second century. In its primitive Roman form the creed lacked a few words or clauses which appear in the later and customary version. It read as follows: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord; who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried; the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And [I believe] in the Holy Ghost; the holy Church; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body."

2. The Nicene Creed. — "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only-begotten, that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, and Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made in heaven and on earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down,

and was incarnate, and was made man; He suffered, and the third day He rose again, and ascended into heaven, from whence He cometh to judge the quick and the dead. And [we believe] in the Holy Ghost. And those who say, there was a time when He [the Son] was not, and that He was not before He was made, and He was made out of nothing, or out of another substance or thing, or the Son of God is created, or changeable, or alterable, the holy catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes."

3. The Creed of Constantinople. — This formulary, which was adopted at the second ecumenical council in 381, repeats the subject-matter of the Nicene creed, enlarging on some of its specifications, particularly that relating to the Holy Spirit, and omitting the anathema. It reads as follows: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and the third day He rose again, according to the Scripture, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; from thence He cometh again, with glory, to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And in the Holy Ghost, who is Lord and Giver of life, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. In one holy catholic and apostolic Church; we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

4. The Creed of Chalcedon. — "Following the holy fathers, we all with one consent teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a rational soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning have declared concerning Him, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself has taught us, and the creed of the holy fathers has handed down to us."

5. The Athanasian Creed. — The so-called Athanasian creed was of private origin. Its composition could not have been earlier than the middle portion of the fifth century. It may be judged that it arose in the school of Augustine, since it reflects his disposition to affirm strongly at once the perfect equality of the three Persons and the unity of the Godhead. With much boldness and detail it sets forth these opposite sides of the trinitarian theory. Its artificial character, or strained elaboration, unfits it for proper use as an ecumenical creed.

II.

THE IGNATIAN PROBLEM.

In the present, as between the brief Syriac recension of three epistles, the shorter of the two Greek recensions of seven epistles, and the longer Greek recension, there is a very general agreement that the second is the more primitive, whether it is to be accounted the unadulterated product of the hand of Ignatius or not.

The greater continuity of thought in the shorter Greek recension suggests rather that the Syriac epistles were made by an abridgment of it than that it arose by enlargement of them. Moreover, the task of abridging would have been a very simple matter, whereas that of enlarging in the manner supposed would have been difficult. No one would have been likely to have attempted so laborious a task except on the score of a desire to modify the contents in favor of some particular views. But doctrinally and ecclesiastically the two lists of epistles are of very much the same tenor.

The longer Greek recension is discredited by points of similarity with the confessedly spurious epistles attributed to Ignatius, by plain indications of borrowing from the writings of Eusebius and the Apostolic Constitutions, and by other tokens of a comparatively late origin. These facts place it in unfavorable contrast with the other Greek recension.

Respecting the genuineness of the shorter Greek recension of the seven epistles, Lightfoot makes the following cogent summary of evidence: —

"1. No Christian writings of the second century, and very few writings of antiquity, whether Christian or pagan,

are so well authenticated as the epistles of Ignatius. If the epistle of Polycarp be accepted as genuine, the authentication is perfect. 2. The main ground of objection against the genuineness of the epistle of Polycarp is its authentication of the Ignatian epistles. Otherwise there is every reason to believe that it would have passed unquestioned. 3. The epistle of Polycarp itself is exceptionally well authenticated by the testimony of his disciple Irenæus. 4. All attempts to explain the phenomena of the epistle of Polycarp, as forged or interpolated to give color to the Ignatian epistles, have signally failed. 5. The external testimony to the Ignatian epistles being so strong, only the most decisive marks of spuriousness in the epistles themselves, as for instance proved anachronisms, would justify us in suspecting them as interpolated or rejecting them as spurious. 6. But so far is this from being the case that one after another the anachronisms urged against these letters have vanished in the light of further knowledge. 7. As regards the argument which Daillé calls 'palmary' — the prevalence of episcopacy as a recognized institution — we may say boldly that all the facts point the other way. If the writer of these letters had represented the churches of Asia Minor as under presbyteral government, he would have contradicted all the evidence, which without one dissentient voice points to episcopacy as the established form of church government in these districts from the close of the first century. 8. The circumstances of the condemnation, captivity, and journey of Ignatius, which have been a stumbling-block to some modern critics, did not present any difficulty to those who lived near the time and therefore knew best what might be expected under the circumstances; and they are sufficiently borne out by examples, more or less analogous, to establish their credibility. 9. The objections to the style and language of the epistles

are beside the purpose. In some cases they arise from a misunderstanding of the writer's meaning. Generally they may be said to rest on the assumption that an apostolic father could not use exaggerated expressions, overstrained images, and the like, — certainly a sandy foundation on which to build an argument. 10. A like answer holds with regard to any extravagances in sentiment or opinion or character. Why should Ignatius not have exceeded the bounds of sober reason or correct taste? Other men in his own and immediately succeeding ages did both. As an apostolic father he was not exempt from the failings, if failings they were, of his age and position. 11. While investigation of the contents of these epistles has yielded this negative result, in dissipating the objections, it has at the same time had a high positive value, as revealing indications of a very early date, and therefore presumably of genuineness, in the surrounding circumstances, more especially in the types of false doctrine which it combats, in the ecclesiastical status which it presents, and in the manner in which it deals with the evangelical and apostolic documents. 12. Moreover, we discover in the personal environments of the assumed writer, and more especially in the notices of his route, many subtle coincidences which we are constrained to regard as undesigned, and which seem altogether beyond the reach of a forger. 13. So likewise the peculiarities in style and diction of the epistles, as also in the representation of the writer's character, are much more capable of explanation in a genuine writing than in a forgery. 14. While external and internal evidence thus combine to assert the genuineness of these writings, no satisfactory account has been or apparently can be given of them as a forgery of a later date than Ignatius. They would be quite purposeless as such; for they entirely omit all topics which would especially interest any subsequent

age. On these grounds we are constrained to accept the Seven Epistles of the Middle Form as the genuine work of Ignatius." [1]

III.

THE PLACING OF HIPPOLYTUS.

THE episcopal rank of Hippolytus is the troublesome factor in the task of locating the theatre of his labors. Were it not for this he could be described as a presbyter of the Roman Church, who was eminent for learning, and fertility in theological writing, and who earned in this way a prestige which made him in some sort a rival of the contemporary bishops of the imperial city.

The episcopal office of Hippolytus seems, however, to be pretty well attested. It is said, indeed, that Prudentius, writing in the early years of the fifth century, applied to him the title of "presbyter;" but this term — supposing it to have been thus applied in the authentic text of Prudentius — might have been used by him in the large sense which was sometimes attached to it in the early centuries. Moreover, the Spanish poet gives an open hint that he may have thought of Hippolytus as possessing episcopal rank, since he speaks of him as the head of a Christian community.[2] A stronger objection to the supposition of episcopal office is this language from an ancient catalogue of Roman bishops: "Eo tempore (anno 235) Pontianus episcopus

[1] The Apostolic Fathers, Part II., vol. i., pp. 407, 409.

[2] Stipati circum juvenes clamore ferebant
Ipsum Christicolis esse caput populis:
Si foret exstinctum propere caput, omnia vulgi
Pectora Romanis sponte sacranda deis.

PERISTEPHANON, *Hymnus* xi.

et Yppolitus presbyter exoles sunt deportati in Sardinia in insula nociva, Severo et Quintino cons." Supposing the Hippolytus in this reference to be identical with the distinguished writer, the language of the catalogue implies that the compiler at least thought of him as only a presbyter, unless perchance he used that term to indicate his relation (held then or previously) to the Roman Church, while beyond this he was understood to be bishop of a suburban community. On the other hand, Eusebius styles him a bishop, though he does not name his diocese.[1] Jerome attaches to him the same rank, and leaves us equally in the dark as to the place of his administration, declaring indeed that he could not ascertain where he had exercised his office.[2] Theodoret speaks of him as bishop and martyr.[3] In his own writings, while he is not found distinctly to claim the office of bishop, he uses language in at least two instances, which might naturally be regarded as implying that office. Speaking of the apostles as recipients and transmitters of the Holy Spirit, he says: "We, as being their successors, and as participators in this grace, high-priesthood, and office of teaching, as well as being reputed guardians of the Church, must not be found deficient in vigilance, or disposed to suppress correct doctrine."[4] In harmony with the participation in high-priesthood which he claims here, he represents himself in another connection as exercising the prerogative of church discipline, speaking of certain persons who, "in accordance with our condemnatory sentence, had been by us ejected from the Church."[5] Altogether, the evidence may be regarded as establishing a presumption in favor of the episcopal rank of Hippolytus.

[1] Hist. Eccl., vi. 20.

[2] De Viris Illust., lxi. Hippolytus, cujusdam ecclesiæ episcopus, nomen quippe urbis scire non potui.

[3] Hæret. Fab., iii. 1.

[4] Philosophum., Proem.

[5] Ibid., ix. 7.

Where, then, are we to locate his diocese? Setting aside the theory which selects Arabia, as having no proper foundation, we are left to choose between Rome and the Port of Rome (Portus Romanus), the one being at a distance of about fifteen miles from the other. In behalf of the former supposition two principal items can be quoted, namely, the close connection of Hippolytus with the affairs of the Roman Church, as evinced in his writings, and the fact that he is named "bishop of Rome" in a number of instances by Greek writers. The force of the second item, however, is qualified by the late date of the writers who use this description. The earliest one of them that Döllinger was able to cite belonged to the closing part of the sixth century. There is also a possibility that this way of referring to Hippolytus may have come about by the hasty act of some Greek writer in substituting Rome for the Port of Rome. The apparent connection of the author of the Philosophumena with the affairs of the Roman Church is a weightier evidence. But the historical critic who, in compliance with this evidence, locates the episcopal administration of the Hippolytus within the city does not escape grave difficulties. On this basis we must suppose that there was a kind of dual episcopate in Rome, a special head being assigned to a Greek-speaking congregation, or else that Hippolytus was a schismatic bishop, — in Roman phrase, the first Anti-Pope. For the former alternative, though it has been held by respectable advocates, the historical warrant is too dim to afford much confidence. The latter alternative is opposed by negative evidence of great force. No catalogue of the Roman bishops makes any mention of Hippolytus as either a legitimate or a schismatic incumbent. Eusebius and Jerome were apparently ignorant of any rival episcopate having been set up by him in the great capital. Supposing such a schism to have occurred,

it must have appeared as the forerunner, almost as the first act, of the Novatian schism, which provoked intense animosity and was branded in severe terms by Catholic writers generally. How did it happen that the odium which was earned by Novatian was not reflected back upon Hippolytus, if the latter only two or three decades before had given an example of rebellion against constituted authority, and had kept the foremost church of Christendom divided for years? We say for years, since the language of Hippolytus, which Döllinger interprets to mean that he denied the title of Callistus to the episcopate, is applied also to his predecessor Zephyrinus. The latter, no less than the former, is mentioned as one who *presumed* that he had become bishop of Rome. The phrase is indeed peculiar in either instance. It shows that Hippolytus, in his abhorrence of these men, was pleased to style them interlopers rather than rightful holders of the Roman episcopate. This, however, is far from justifying the conclusion that he claimed for himself the honor which he shrank from formally assigning to them.

A slight abatement ought perhaps to be made from the assumption that in the thought of succeeding generations nothing of the odium of schism attached to Hippolytus. Prudentius speaks of him as having been for a season a disciple of Novatian,[1] but as having in the end denounced his schismatic project,[2] — an account that has small claim to credibility, since, if any relation to Novatian is to be predicated of Hippolytus, it would naturally be that of forerunner and preceptor.

[1] Quondam schisma Novatii attigerat.

[2] Consultus, quaenam secta foret melior,
Respondit: Fugite, O miseri exsecranda Novati
Schismata: catholicis reddite vos populis.
Una fides vigeat, prisco quæ condita templo est:
Quam Paulus retinet, quamque Cathedra Petri.

While thus the theory that Hippolytus was a schismatic bishop of Rome lacks the evidence which is needed for a well-grounded confidence, it must at the same time be confessed that the rival theory has but scanty historical data on its side. The most that is worth quoting is the apparent intent of the not over-critical Prudentius to represent Hippolytus as head of the church at Portus, the accordant statement of Anastasius, who was a papal secretary resident in Constantinople in the latter part of the seventh century, and the tradition which has been more or less current since that date.

It may be concluded that the superior learning of Hippolytus secured him a certain eminence among the clergy of Rome and the neighborhood. It may also be concluded that he was a man of somewhat assertatory temper, not altogether above the temptation to vanity, and that accordingly his representation rather enlarges than minifies the importance of his antagonism to the contemporary Roman bishops. If to these conclusions we add the supposition that Hippolytus was a resident of Rome before he became bishop, and that his bishopric was in the neighborhood of the city, so that he could easily entertain and manifest an interest in the management of the Christian community there, we have at once a plausible explanation of his connection with the church at Rome and of his episcocal title. In the view of history, therefore, it may be regarded as possible that Hippolytus was bishop of Portus. The opposing theory, which makes him a schismatic bishop of Rome, though supported by very learned and able investigators, needs better proof than has been offered, to give it an exclusive title to credence.

IV.

THE HATCH-HARNACK THEORY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN ORGANIZATION.

In the Bampton Lectures of 1880 Edwin Hatch gave utterance to views which have been fruitful of much examination and discussion. Two fundamental conceptions shaped his exposition of early Christian organization, as there presented: (1) an emphatic view of the great importance which the subject of charities had in the first centuries among Christians; (2) a like emphatic view of the influence exercised upon the Christians by the civil and social institutions of the classic world, as opposed to a dominant influence of purely Jewish institutions.

Hatch gives both of these conceptions a prominent place in his account of the rise and development of the episcopal office, and also allows considerable scope to the second in connection with the office of presbyter.

The first century, he says, was the crisis epoch in the economic history of the Western world. Large numbers were brought down to the plane of pauperism. Even among the heathen the crying need evoked a response, and caused a special stress to be placed upon the virtue of practical philanthropy. But still the Christians were preeminent in works of benevolence. "Other associations were charitable; but whereas in them charity was an accident, in the Christian associations it was of the essence."

In proportion as the Church was a charitable association, Hatch argues, the chief administrator of charities in any congregation must have held an eminent position; the

tendency must have been in fact to look to him as the foremost official.

A cause still further increasing the importance of the director of charities was the public way in which the benevolence was managed. Offerings for the poor were brought into the sanctuary, and their bestowment was a part of the Sunday service. The conditions suggested that the same person should be president of the service and manager of the charities. In the union of these two functions we have the primitive bishop, the ἐπίσκοπος. This officer was the head of a congregation or local church, as being the manager of its charities and the leader of its worship.

In this description we have used the singular number; but Hatch, if we judge aright, allows us to use the plural, or to suppose that a committee of several persons shared the functions in question.

In the view of Hatch the name of the officer [ἐπίσκοπος], and very largely the idea of the office, were supplied by heathen society. Having noted that the heathen had numerous associations, in some of which the religious interest was foremost, he says: "If we turn to the contemporary non-Christian associations of Asia Minor and Syria — to the nearest neighbors, that is to say, of the Christian organizations — we find that the officers of administration and finance were chiefly known by one or other of two names, not far distant from one another in either form or meaning. The one of these was ἐπιμελητής, the other was the name which became so strongly impressed on the officers of the Christian societies as to have held its place until modern times, and which in almost all countries of both East and West has preserved its form through all the vicissitudes of its meaning, — the Greek ἐπίσκοπος, the English *bishop*."

The bishops, or chief almoners in the Christian com-

munity, as Hatch seems to infer, naturally were taken from the rank of the presbyters, and one of them was also the likeliest candidate for the chairmanship or presidency of the council of elders. By a gradual advance the office of president acquired great dignity and influence, and its incumbent was singled out as *the* bishop, the individual head of the local church.

The original function of the presbyters as such, Hatch contends, was purely administrative and disciplinary. They were not teachers or leaders of the worship and only gradually attained to this class of functions.

As respects the source of the presbyterate, Hatch grants that it had a prototype in Jewish communities, and holds that when such communities became Christian they simply put to the use of the new religion an already existing institute. But at the same time he thinks that *Gentile* communities had in their social and civil organization very distinct patterns for such an institution as the presbyterate, so that they had no need to borrow from outside. "Every municipality of the empire was managed by its curia or senate. Every one of the associations, political or religious, with which the empire swarmed, had its committee of officers. It was therefore antecedently probable, even apart from Jewish influence, that when the Gentiles who had embraced Christianity began to be sufficiently numerous in a city to require some kind of organization, that organization should take the prevailing form; that it should be not wholly, if at all, monarchical, nor wholly, though essentially, democratic, but that there should be a permanent executive consisting of a plurality of persons."

The relation between bishops and presbyters is not very clearly defined by Hatch; but he seems to assume three stages in that relation. Primarily the two terms denoted different classes of officials, the bishops being almoners and

also, very generally, teachers and presidents in the Sunday service, whereas the presbyters were a board of administration and discipline. The bishops might be presbyters, but the presbyters were not necessarily bishops. Farther on [about the end of the first century] the presbyters had commonly assumed teaching and ceremonial functions, and so had become assimilated in office to the bishops. In the third stage, one in the group of officers acquired a sort of monarchical authority in the congregation, and so became a bishop in the later sense.

Harnack is at one with Hatch in the importance which he assigns to the adminstration of charities in the early Church, and the great influence which he assumes to have been exercised upon Christian organization by the institutions of heathen society. He differs by the larger stress which he places upon the charismatic ministry, or the ministers extraordinary, like apostles, evangelists, and prophets, whom he regards as having engrossed largely the teaching function in the Church for a considerable interval after the original apostles had passed off the stage. He differs also by supposing that the πρεσβύτεροι had at first no distinct official standing, being simply the elderly men of the congregation who would naturally have an influential voice in matters of common concern. His scheme implies a somewhat slower evolution of the Christian ministry towards its ultimate type than is assumed by Hatch.

In considering the merits of Hatch's theory we cannot escape the conviction that it involves certain improbabilities and difficulties. We find no adequate ground for reducing, as he does, the relative influence of Jewish institutions as models to the first Christians. For a couple of decades the Church was very closely connected with Judaism. Practical necessity must have brought about within this interval at least an incipient organization, — the general

basis and framework for the future constitution. Moreover, when the Church extended her borders into the Gentile world, the chief agents of the extension were those who had been trained from childhood in Judaism and who naturally therefore were more dominated by Jewish than by Gentile patterns.

The facts which are cited by Hatch do not sufficiently sustain his theory; at any rate, various critics affirm that his Gentile ἐπίσκοπος, the supposed prototype of the Christian official, is a rather shadowy and uncertain personage. "The proof," says Heron, "which he offers in support of his theory seems to us to be altogether inadequate. As Dr. Sanday has pointed out, the few allusions that are found to ἐπίσκοποι in connection with associations or temples are insufficient to prove that such use of the term was anything but occasional and rare; and M. Waddington infers from a study of the inscriptions that the Christian use of the term was derived, not from Greek associations, but from its occurrence in Syria or Palestine."[1]

Another objection to Hatch's theory is found in the difficulty of reconciling it with the tenor of New Testament representation, not to say also of post-apostolic literature. We find here no proper warrant for making the management of charities in so emphatic a sense the peculiar function of the primitive bishop, or for distinguishing between bishops and presbyters as to official standing. In fact, any one who believes in the genuineness of the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles cannot easily accept the theory of Hatch. As for Harnack's version of the theory, he admits that it cannot stand, if the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles are writings of the first century.

[1] Church of the Sub-Apostolic Age, pp. 202, 203.

V.

ROMAN BISHOPS AND EMPERORS.

Date of Accession.	Bishops.	Emperors.
54		Nero.
67	Linus.	
68		Galba.
69		Otho.
		Vitellius.
70		Vespasian.
79	Anacletus.	Titus.
81		Domitian.
92	Clement I.	
96		Nerva.
98		Trajan.
101	Evaristus.	
109	Alexander I.	
117		Hadrian.
119	Xystus (or Sixtus I.).	
127	Telesphorus.	
138		Antoninus Pius.
139	Hyginus.	
142	Pius I.	
157	Anicetus.	
161		Marcus Aurelius.
168	Soter.	
177	Eleutherus.	
180		Commodus.
190–192	Victor I.	
192		Pertinax.
193		Septimus Severus.
202	Zephyrinus.	
211		Caracalla.
217		Macrinus.
218	Callistus.	Heliogabalus.

Date of Accession.	Bishops.	Emperors.
222		Alexander Severus.
223	Urban I.	
230	Pontianus.	
235	Anterus.	Maximin (the Thracian).
236	Fabianus.	
238		Gordian (the Younger).
244		Philip (the Arabian).
249		Decius.
251	Cornelius.	Gallus.
253	Lucius I.	
253	Stephan I.	Valerian.
257	Xystus (Sixtus) II.	
259	Dionysius.	
260		Gallienus.
268		Claudius II.
269	Felix I.	
270		Aurelian.
275	Eutychianus.	Tacitus.
276		Probus.
282		Carus.
283	Caius.	
284		Diocletian.
286		Maximian (joint emperor).
296	Marcellinus.	
304–307	See vacant.	
305		Constantius. Galerius.
306		Constantine. Maxentius.
307		Licinius.
308	Marcellus.	Maximin II.
309–310	Eusebius.	
311	Melchiades.	
314	Sylvester I.	
323		Constantine, as sole emperor.

Date of Accession.	Bishops.	Emperors.
336	Marcus.	
337	Julius I.	Constantine II. Constantius II. Constans.
350		Constantius II., as sole emperor.
352	Liberius.	
361		Julian.
363		Jovian.
364		Valentinian I. Valens.
366	Damasus.	
375		Gratian. Valentinian II.
379		Theodosius.
385	Siricius.	
394		Theodosius, as sole emperor.
395		Arcadius (east). Honorius (west).
398	Anastasius I.	
402	Innocent I.	
408		Theodosius II. (east).
417	Zosimus.	
418	Boniface I.	
422	Coelestine I.	
423		Valentinian III. (west).
432	Sixtus III.	
440	Leo I.	
450		Marcian (east).
455		Maximus Avitus (west.)
457		Majorian (west).
457		Leo I. (east).
461	Hilarius.	Severus (west).
467		Anthemius (west).
468	Simplicius.	
472		Olybrius (west).

Date of Accession.	Bishops.	Emperors.
473		Glycerius (west).
474		Julius Nepos (west).
474		Leo II. (east).
474		Zeno (east).
475		Romulus Augustulus, with whom the Western empire ends in 476.
476		Basiliscus.
483	Felix II.	
491		Anastasius I.
492	Gelasius I.	
496	Anastasius II.	
498	Symmachus.	
514	Hormisdas.	
518		Justin I.
523	John I.	
526	Felix III.	
527		Justinian.
530	Boniface II.	
532	John II.	
535	Agapetus I.	
536	Sylverius.	
540	Vigilius.	
555	Pelagius I.	
560	John III.	
565		Justin II.
574	Benedict I.	Tiberius II.
578	Pelagius II.	
582		Maurice.
590	Gregory I.	

It should be observed that the dates assigned to the earlier bishops are somewhat conjectural; and that the scheme of associate emperors introduced by Diocletian gave a result which is too complex for convenient representation in its details within the limits of a brief table.

INDEX.